

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. I, No. 24
WHOLE No. 1276

March 17, 1934

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS —Note and Comment	557-561
TOPICS OF INTEREST: The New Deal in Spain by Lawrence A. Fernsworth— Violating the NRA by Floyd Anderson—What Does Dollfuss Want? by John LaFarge, S.J.—The Birthplace of St. Patrick by John W. Moran, S.J.....	562-568
POETRY: Portraits—Paradox	567; 572
SOCIOLOGY: That Child-Labor Amendment by John Wiltbye.....	568-569
EDUCATION: False Weights and Measures by Paul L. Blakely, S.J.....	570-571
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF by The Pilgrim.....	571-572
LITERATURE: Charles Kingsley, Warrior and Emotionalist by Everett J. Conway	573-574
REVIEW OF BOOKS ...574-576.. COMMUNICATIONS ...577.. CHRONICLE ...	578-580

Neither Fascism Nor Communism

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S speech to the NRA Code authorities, which nearly coincided with the anniversary of his taking office, may well be considered as the matured form of his thought on that section of his policies which is being worked out gradually in the NRA. He was at pains, of course, to point out that NRA is only one part of those policies, which are being developed on many fronts, but he was equally at pains to insist that it is a permanent policy, and that it looks to both recovery and reform. His very criticism of the past is evidence of this:

The difficult and dangerous situation into which the United States had got itself was due to the general attitude, "every man for himself; and the devil take the hindmost." Individuals were seeking quick riches at the expense of other individuals. Geographical sections were seeking economic preference for themselves to the disadvantage of other sections. Cities were recklessly offering inducements to manufacturing plants to move away from other cities. Within given industries unfair competition went on unheeded or resulted in vast consolidations whose securities were peddled to the public at dishonest prices. There was little consideration for the social point of view and no planning whatsoever to avoid the pitfalls of overproduction or of selling methods which foisted articles on a gullible public which the family budget could not afford.

These severe words will have had a familiar sound in every Catholic ear, and they have been duplicated many times in this Review itself. The fundamental error of our times was much more than mere economic folly; it was a moral error, the sin of selfishness and greed, blind even to its own ultimate profit.

When Mr. Roosevelt came to justify himself before the world, and no doubt before himself also, he showed that he is well aware of the two opposite charges that have been made against his proposed plan for "industrial

self-government," as he well styles it: it cannot be both Communism and Fascism at the same time, as it is charged with being. It must, therefore, be something between those two extremes. The President describes it as industrial democracy, or as he says, "representative government in industry." The two industrial groups that make it up, labor and management, are bidden to respect each other's functions, rights and duties, and to cooperate for the good of the industry and of the people as a whole. The part of the Government in the process is to make it possible by legislation and initiative for these two groups to cooperate, and also to "protect the third group—the consumer—and that word *consumer* means the whole American people." What is sought out of this process is "balance: balance between agriculture and industry, and balance between the wage earner, the employer, and the consumer. We seek also balance that our internal market be kept rich and large, and that our trade with other nations be increased on both sides of the ledger." It is obvious, though the President does not say it directly, that the balance wheels will be justice and charity; for he asserts: "The morality of the case is that a great segment of our people are in actual distress, and that as between profits first and humanity afterwards and humanity first and profits afterwards we have no room for hesitation."

Here again, in all this, the Catholic will recognize his own language, and the governing idea of that great economic Encyclical, "On the Reconstruction of the Social Order." He will see, however, at first glance, that it falls far short of the economic reforms proposed by the Pope, whose ideal is much nearer that of Chancellor Dollfuss, as described by Father LaFarge in this issue, than that of the American plan, which is limited by the necessities of the American situation. The Pope would give more scope to government than would Mr. Roosevelt, who is

bound by the limited powers granted to our Federal Government. The democratic self-government of industry under the Papal plan would be more radical than it is at present under NRA, for labor and management would be brought closer together, according to him, by ascribing more powers to labor in management, and bringing the general consuming public closer to both in settling the policies of each industry, even those in which the consumer is not a producer. On the other hand, in its political aspects, the Roosevelt plan is nearer to the Pope's than Dollfuss'—or Hitler's or Mussolini's for that matter—for this democratic, self-governing industry will not be called in with us to control the Government itself, or indeed to exercise any political powers whatsoever, as it does under Fascism.

The President's suggestions for decreased hours of labor and increased wages clouded—in the minds of the headline writers at least—the real issue, which was a philosophical one. It may well be considered by him if it would not be better to seek to introduce these changes, not as a general rule, but on a graduated scale, where the traffic will bear it for the good of all. But the important thing is the moral lesson which the President has once more read the country.

Another Good Word

SOME weeks ago, we protested against the misuse in this muddle-headed world of so many good words. Our first selection included "radical" and "mystic." But we are not sure that "supernatural" is not by rights the Abou ben Adhem of the list.

"Radical" of course, means in the muddle-headed world an anarchist, just as "mystic" means a harmless sort of lunatic. "Supernatural" however, has a multitude of meanings, especially in current journalese, and all of them are silly. Thus when a reporter thinks he sees the outline of a figure on a window pane, he cannot resist the temptation to describe it as "supernatural." A matter-of-fact investigation would probably show that the housewife had been a bit too economical in the use of soap, water, and elbow grease.

At Lourdes, the word must be spoken in a tone of light and airy trifling, or of mild and superior contempt. The breakfast room of any hotel which caters to English or American visitors, will furnish a wealth of examples. "It's all quite interesting," an eagle-beaked matron will remark, as another piece of toast goes crunchingly down, "but, of course, it's only supernatural." It is, indeed, but not as the poor lady means it. What she intends to convey is that "supernatural" is something palpably silly, unworthy the attention of an intellect brought to perfection under the Grand Old Flag. But did Huxley, in his deliciously nonsensical page about Lourdes, do any better? Indeed, our current philosophical literature has not risen perceptibly above Huxley or the lady with the toast.

The prowling Chesterton recently came upon Philo Vance (of all people!) in the act of showing the substantial identity of "supernatural" with "unreasonable."

This admirable Hawkshaw by eschewing the supernatural, and relying entirely upon his keen intellect, was able, he reports, to cut through the strings that bound up the mystery of the Haunted Manse, and so give to the world another best seller. Now in a world that draws no distinction between "unreasonable" and "supernatural," the Cheshire Cat is doubtless a familiar fireside companion. But has it never occurred to this famous detective that the test for any claim, natural or supernatural, is evidence, or that, to quote Chesterton, those who testify to the supernatural produce plenty of evidence? In Huxley's own time, Pasteur found that evidence satisfying. In our own day, we may safely pit Chesterton against Philo Vance.

Secretary Wallace on the Amendment

TWO members of the President's Cabinet are taking an active part in urging the adoption of the alleged child-labor Amendment. No Federal statute bars any Federal office holder from expressing his opinion on pending legislation, and under recent Presidents we have had many examples of officials widely pressing their opinions. But we have a right to demand that in their arguments members of the President's official family, more than any others, scrupulously respect the facts in the case.

This Review has long had a high regard for the many qualities of the Secretary of Agriculture, and has watched his development in recent months with increasing respect. This makes it all the more regrettable that in a letter published on March 7 by the National Child Labor Committee he should have seen fit to characterize as "nonsense" the objection that under the Amendment "farm boys and girls would no longer be permitted to help with the chores." The epithet is strong, but it was doubly unfortunate that he should have given this reason for it: "Every fair-minded person who knows anything at all about the Amendment knows that it [the objection] is nonsense." Mr. Wallace, therefore, would seem to consider the use of that argument as evidencing ignorance, or worse.

Nor can it be said that in his answer to the argument the Secretary makes his case any better. "The Amendment is directed at protecting children," he writes, "from industrialized and commercialized employment which endangers their health and interferes with their schooling." Quite probably this is the direction which the Secretary would give the Amendment, but it is not the only direction which the Amendment can be given. For in plain language the Amendment vests Congress with power "to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age." This power extends not only to children but to young men and women, and it is not limited to persons in industrialized or commercialized employment, but extends to all "labor" of any kind, physical or mental, whether this labor be hurtful to health or schooling, or is quite innocuous. Mr. Wallace may well think that Congress will of itself restrict these powers to commercialized or industrialized employment, but there is nothing

in the Amendment to make Congress so restrict itself, and every effort to put any such restriction in the Amendment was defeated by Congress itself. Unfortunately, the opinions of no Cabinet member are likely to have any effect in that direction, and when Mr. Wallace asks us to believe that the Amendment is solely directed against such limited employment, he suggests a position which has no foundation whatever in the Amendment itself.

The point is of importance, not only in connection with the Amendment, but with all legislation. "No rule of constitutional construction is more firmly settled," writes William D. Guthrie, for many years Ruggles Professor of Constitutional Law at Columbia, "than that the limited desires or good intentions of the proponents of a constitutional amendment are immaterial, when the language is clear. . . . There is no room for construction, and no excuse for interpolation, or addition, or limitation." Mr. Guthrie merely states a doctrine that has been repeatedly affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Unfortunately it is a doctrine frequently overlooked by those who frame our social legislation.

The Rochester Milk Case

WHEN on April 19, 1934, Leo Nebbia, the owner of a small grocery in Rochester, New York, sold two quarts of milk and a loaf of bread to his friend Jedo del Signore for eighteen cents, he probably thought that the transaction was nothing more than a good stroke of business. What Leo really did that morning was to start a case that racked the brains of nine learned and patriotic Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and ended by dividing their opinions by a vote of five to four.

The facts in the case are simple. In order to regulate to the common advantage an industry which sold milk to 14,000,000 people, the State of New York by legislative enactment fixed the minimum price of milk at nine cents per quart. The State courts held that by adding the bread, Nebbia violated the law. He was convicted and fined, and on appeal the case was certified to the Supreme Court of the United States. Nebbia's defense was that since he could sell milk at a lower price than the State's minimum, and still make a profit, the law "contravened the equal-protection clause and due-process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment."

It will be perceived that the Court was not asked to pass upon the National Recovery Act, or any Federal statute. "The question for decision is whether the Federal Constitution prohibits a State from so fixing the price of milk." The issue, therefore, turned specifically on the extent of the police powers of the several States. The majority opinion, read by Mr. Justice Roberts, and concurred in by the Chief Justice, Justices Brandeis, Stone, and Cardozo, held that in fixing a minimum price for milk, the State of New York had not exceeded the limit of its powers. All that was required to meet due process was "that the law shall not be unreasonable, arbitrary, or capricious, and that the means selected shall have a

real and substantial relation to the object sought to be obtained." The minority opinion, read by Mr. Justice McReynolds, and concurred in by Justices Butler, Sutherland, and Van Devanter, held that acting on an assumption of emergency, the State of New York had so fixed the price of a commodity that the result was in violation of the rights of the small dealer, and harmful to the community.

Where men of learning dissent, it is rash to dogmatize. Still, in these days of shifting standards, it is reassuring to know that a majority of the Court hold to the old Constitutional standards, and define with clarity, while they affirm with assurance, the legitimate sovereignty of the States. Even more grateful, perhaps, is it to read the principle set forth by Mr. Justice Roberts in the following words:

Neither property rights nor contract rights are absolute; for government cannot exist if the citizen may at will use his property to the detriment of his fellows, or exercise his freedom of contract to do them harm. Equally fundamental with the private right is that of the public to regulate it to the public interest.

And again:

The Constitution does not secure to anyone liberty to conduct his business in such fashion as to inflict injury upon the public at large, or upon any substantial group of the people. Price control, like any other form of regulation, is unconstitutional only if arbitrary, discriminatory, or demonstrably irrelevant to the policy which the legislature is free to adopt. . . .

The majority decision should encourage the States to greater zeal in protecting the citizen against all forms of organized capitalism used "in such fashion as to inflict injury upon the public." The rights which the States possess in this respect entail strict duties.

In the Cross Our Strength

THE growth of Good Friday observance in this country in the last dozen years is most remarkable. In nine States, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee, as well as in the Philippines and Porto Rico, Good Friday has been made a legal holiday. Bills in this sense have been recently introduced in several General Assemblies, among them that of New York.

Apart from legal prescription, however, many employers voluntarily excuse their workers on Good Friday, or allow them several hours in the morning or afternoon, to attend church services. The public devotion of the Three Hours in honor of the Agony of Our Lord upon His Cross, which was a rarity at the opening of the century, is now held in practically every city in the country, and has even been introduced into many non-Catholic congregations. It is common to find in the Catholic churches in our larger cities that the Mass of the Pre-sanctified is followed by almost continuous services throughout the afternoon and evening, so that hardly a moment passes that does not see hundreds of people on their knees adoring Him Who for our transgressions was hanged upon the bitter Tree. The crowds that throng the confessionals after a day devoted in this manner show

clearly that these "Good Friday devotions" are the occasion of marvelous outpourings of God's grace.

These manifestations of love for Our Lord Jesus Christ Crucified are most consoling. The great depression through which we are passing is a time of testing for all, and for many a time in which the temptation to despair is very pressing. Only those who do not know what religion is can say that it is the opiate of the people. Men and women who profess it in deed and not in word only know that it is the wine that revivifies and the bread that quickens. At the foot of the Cross where a blind and heedless world casts lots, we shall find the strength and the courage which we need to carry our cross through this darkness to the glory that shall be revealed to us.

Note and Comment

Germans in The Colonies

A CORRESPONDENT in Holland writes that according to *De Maasbode*, a Catholic publication, "When the United States were founded, in the Congress of that day only one vote was lacking to make the language of the country the German language." He asks if there is any authority for this statement. Possibly some learned reader can supply the right answer, but it seems to us that the statement must be ranked with witch burnings at Salem, little George's destructive hatchet, and other charming and not so charming Colonial fables. It is true that emigration from Germany and Switzerland, which began on a large scale about 1709, caused the authorities in Pennsylvania some uneasiness, and Franklin at one time feared that the Germans would establish their language in that State to the exclusion of English. Still, according to Greene, in his "Foundations of American Nationality," an authoritative study, the Americans of 1750 were predominantly English in race and language, and remained English until at least the close of the Colonial period. On the eve of the Revolution, the Germans are estimated to have formed about one-third of the population of Pennsylvania, but only one-tenth of that of the thirteen Colonies, and in view of this fact it is highly improbable that any serious attempt should have been undertaken "to make the language of the country the German language." The Dutch journal's vague reference to "Congress" might refer to the Continental Congress (1774), the Congress of the Confederation (1781), or the first Congress under the Federal Constitution (1789), but we know of no such attempt at any of these gatherings. Franklin might have advanced the proposition in a waggish mood at the Constitutional Convention (although there is no record of it) but those early Congresses knew well that if the Colonists wished to speak Choctaw, or English, or Lapp, the choice was their own, and no business of Congress. Well might those bodies have hesitated to inform Praise God Barebones, of Plymouth, or George Washington, of Virginia, that since

the official tongue of the country was German, they must forthwith correspond with the Government in the language of Goethe!

St. Patrick's Appearance

PALEONTOLOGISTS, upon investigation, have informed the public that it was impossible for St. Patrick to have banished the snakes from Ireland. The reason assigned for this impossibility was similar to that afforded by Charles Lamb's Scotchman as to the difficulty of greeting the deceased Bobby Burns, viz., that the snakes were already absent. The late Kuno Meyer, eminent philologist, proposed the theory that the Danes of Dublin explained the name Patrick or Padraig as *pad rekr* (toad banisher); hence the legend. Now come the archeologists into the field, and discuss whether or not the Saint wore a beard, commercial statues to the contrary notwithstanding. L. S. Gogan, a member of the Academy of Christian Art, made a study of this matter, and gave some of his findings, based on the studies of Henry Morris, in the *Standard*, of Dublin, in 1932. According to Mr. Morris, Patrick was beardless. First, he was a Roman citizen; and Roman citizens were usually clean-shaven. A stone found in Faughart churchyard, which appeared to come from the thirteenth or fourteenth century, represented him as beardless. The earliest bearded Patrick was an engraving by L. Gaultier made in 1619 and published in 1624. On the other hand, a figure of the Apostle made in 1353, where he is seen presenting a shrine to St. Mac Cairthinn, is beardless; and the Fiacal Padraig, made twenty years later, is likewise without a beard. Other iconographical items are alleged. That the Saint wore no mitre is argued from the bareheaded condition of ecclesiastics up to the twelfth century, but he carried the crozier, and wore the alb and chasuble. His ready welcome by the Irish princes points to his having been tall and fair, like themselves; as the small and dark were unpopular with the Irish nobility. And he was a Saint of action driving in chariots and climbing mountains, not of statuesque immobility. All of which may offer a stimulus to our budding liturgical artists.

Warning The Young

A RECENT study by the International Labor Office in Geneva uncovers an important weakness in our modern educational system: the neglect of proper orientation of the young as to the possibilities of entering the professions. The overcrowding of the professions was found to be a world-wide phenomenon. In Germany there were only 1,100 annual vacancies for 1,700 newly qualified doctors; in France 500 for over 1,000; in Norway about 50 for above 100; in Jugoslavia 200 for 350; (and similar reports for dentists, nurses, etc.). In Argentina 150 dentists were graduated annually for about 100 positions. Among the causes of professional unemployment were listed:

The expansion of public elementary and secondary education; the lure of belong to a non-manual profession; the ignorance of

boys and girls and their parents concerning the difficulties with which the professions are beset; the low standard of the curricula and examinations in high schools; the obvious unemployment in the manual occupation . . . ; and the present general distress which induces many persons with remunerated posts (civil servants, for instance) to seek additional profit in the liberal professions (journalism, graphic arts, etc.).

Technological improvements also had their share. Each of the above list of causes well deserves consideration. How much serious thought is given by educators toward enlightening boys and girls as to the actual difficulties which they will meet with in the professions? And how sharply are we to pay the penalty for the reckless expansion of democratic higher education?

Is NRA Doomed?

READERS of Floyd Anderson's article in this issue may be tempted to ask if the evidences of unregenerate human nature which he describes mean that the plan of self-government in industry set on foot by the Administration is impractical. Those who take this cynical viewpoint recall the ill-fated Prohibition experiment and ask if you can ever legislate good morals in business. The answer is that the two cases are utterly different. First of all, Prohibition did not have the support of most of the people, while the vast majority of business men are in favor of planning to avoid overproduction and eliminate the gambling and unfair competition that brought us to our sorry pass. Moreover, while it is true that NRA requires higher moral standards as a condition of its success, those standards are not the direct object of the experiment, as was Prohibition, but a definite set of cooperative actions which are primarily commercial and only secondarily moral.

Maggie Mullany

THIS is the story of Maggie Mullany. Maggie died last week in Manhattan and all the journals gave her a column—glory perhaps, as glory goes in Manhattan—but it was nothing compared to the blowing of the trumpets that greeted Maggie that same day as she entered into heaven. Maggie was an orphan and a mere slip of a girl when she got a job as maid in the Grand Hotel. That was forty-seven years ago, when Cleveland was in his first term. The gilded hostelry was then one of the centers of New York life, and she came to know all its guests. As the century turned, the Grand Hotel lost much of its former elegance, but through the decades Maggie cheerfully kept her job—sweeping, dusting, polishing until the other day when she died. The newspapers called her the oldest hotel maid in the country and paid tribute to her cheerfulness and wit and smiling charity. But neither was Maggie's chief claim to fame. Maggie Mullany loved God, and God loved Maggie Mullany. For forty-seven years she went to daily Mass. In all that time she never missed a single morning. Every day, as regularly as the dawn, Maggie hastened around the corner to the Franciscan church, there to consecrate her day's toil with the Sacrifice of Praise. When they

found her dead in her room last week, she was fully dressed and ready for early Mass, and a prayer book was lying beside her hat and purse. Seven stories below on Broadway the trucks rumbled, the taxis screeched, and the subway roared; down in the lobby of the hotel there was the usual morning scurry and bustle. The city and its Grand Hotel were beginning a new day. But around the corner in the church that Maggie loved, the priest was chanting the Epistle of the Mass. "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord," he sang; "He shall be as a tree planted by the water. His leaf shall be green, and he shall not cease to bring forth fruit." It was the perfect epitaph for Maggie Mullany.

The Maltese Knights

IT may be hard to catch a glimpse of the silver lining supposed to be edging our depression clouds, but Catholics do get a peep at it when they climb the mountain of Faith. One burst of light that has made this year memorable has been falling upon the Vatican since the opening of the Holy Year. An unending line of pious pilgrims, singly and in large groups, have gone to Rome to pay homage to the Prince of the Apostles. It has been a cheering, heartening demonstration of faith, fortitude, and love—the Christian answer of hope and trust to the melancholic, despairing lamentation of a pagan world in its death struggle. What more fitting than that this Holy Year should close with the solemn pageantry of plumed Knights wearing the uniforms and insignia of the heroes of Jerusalem, Rhodes, and Malta? And so it shall be. On March 14 the Knights of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, answering the call of their Grand Master, Ludovico Chigi Albani, will parade in all their ancient glory before the Pope, the King of Italy, and Premier Mussolini. The Knights go to gain the indulgences of the Holy Year and to pledge their loyalty to the Church and Christ's Vicar who will honor them at a special audience. The King and Queen of Italy also will receive the Knights and their ladies. It should be a spectacular display with a flare of medieval chivalry. And admiring memory will see following this procession the bold heroes of a glorious past, La Vallette of Malta, and d'Aubusson and Villiers of Rhodes.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

PAUL L. BLAKELY	WILFRID PARSONS	
GERARD B. DONNELLY	Editor-in-Chief	
	FRANCIS X. TALBOT	JOHN LA FARGE
	FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN	DANIEL BASSETT
	Associate Editors	
	FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager	

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEdallion 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The New Deal In Spain

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH

February 14.

AFTER three months of power the forces that constitute Spain's new Government are getting their stride and the drama of Spanish politics is again under way. The Lerroux Government has just emerged from a political debate wherein it sidestepped a crisis, thus clearing the way for a future political debate and a future crisis. Spanish politics moves like that—it has the technique and swing of spectacular drama. The formation of the new Government, the dramatic and impassioned political debate carried out after the grand manner, the impasse temporarily passed, the surging of new conflicts with a proper seasoning of intrigue, the crisis at last, its resolution and the curtain—these are the elements.

It is purely circumstantial whether the play runs to one act or five. The Spaniard likes his parliamentary show, likes to stand in the plaza or sit in the terrace of his café and discuss its points through his loud speaker, likes to settle down for the next spectacle when the old one is over; he grows unhappy and morose when he cannot have it. It has sometimes seemed to this writer that the dictatorship, in failing to appreciate this, erred fatally.

Upon the theatricals just ended there has followed a rather tense interlude which finds actors and their sympathizers sharply divided into two hostile camps. There are the Rights who have the ascendancy and who see the rather bedraggled Lefts as preparing for revolution. The Lefts, for their part, talk a great deal about revolution and a united front of their parties and the proletariat because, they say, the Rights are trying to crush them with a new dictatorship. Neither revolution nor dictatorship may come. In Spain nothing is rasher than prophecy.

When the noses were counted after last November's elections it was found that the combined forces of the Right had 210 deputies (since increased to 220) in a Parliament whose total was 473. In the center stood Señor Lerroux's Radical party with 102 deputies and a few scattered fractions of parties, while the Lefts had only 93, the other seats being unclassified or vacant. Thus the Rights held the whip hand, although lacking a majority. The leader of their most numerous group, then the CEDA (since called *Acción Popular Agraria*), and their most outstanding figure, is Don José Maria Gil Robles, more commonly called Gil Robles. His party has 111 seats and is in close alliance with the Agrarian party (30 seats) whose leader is Don Martin de Velasco. As the names of these two parties imply, they are interested, among other things, in solving Spain's pressing agrarian problem.

Gil Robles is an energetic young newspaper man, assistant editor of the Catholic organ *El Debate*; he is only thirty-five years old and has been by tradition a Monarchist although his monarchism was never highly pronounced. His attitude toward the Republic may be taken as expressed in *El Debate* on December 15:

It declared that the interests of the Church were not incompatible with the republican form of government and bespoke "a *politica* of Catholics . . . inasmuch as the *politica* of the anterior regime expended itself principally upon the matter of religion." It accepted the words of the Pope, addressed to Spanish pilgrims only the day before, whereby His Holiness asked them to "work for the honor of God, for rights of conscience and for the sanctity of the family and the school," and to make "a generous renunciation of their private and particular opinions in favor of the common good and of Spain."

Thus the Republic was placed on probation as to its future conduct toward the Church. In the Cortes, Señor Robles made it clear that in return for his support of the new ministry he would seek a concordat with Rome and the abrogation of the Religious Congregation laws which closed and to some extent expropriated religious schools. He also said that the Constitution would have to be reformed, but by Constitutional methods; that neither violence nor dictatorship was to be countenanced, and that "in the period of evolution toward a final goal there was a wide field for fruitful political action in land and labor reforms, in economic development and in religious pacification."

The newly functioning Government extended the life of the remaining religious schools which would otherwise have had to close; it examined a project for a Concordat and choose an Ambassador to the Vatican. It further decided to concede life pensions, not exceeding two-thirds of their previous salaries, to priests at least forty years old who on April 13, 1931, were titular pastors in towns of not more than 3,000 population. This would relieve distress among the clergy and reopen churches in places where the people were too poor to support them fully. Señor Robles presented a bill for the relief of the unemployed of which the principal features were compulsory insurance toward which the worker, the employer, and the State would contribute; for the wider employment of labor in public works, and for voluntary labor camps wherein the workers would have the benefits of physical, intellectual, and moral education and receive clothing, food, transportation money, and a stipend.

All this irritated the Socialists and other Left parties. The work of the Republic was being destroyed; the Church was being restored to power; labor was to be submitted to a Fascist regime; the masses would be crushed if they did not immediately arise. Such was their cry.

In the meantime the position of the Lerroux party was becoming more equivocal. The word went out that it was the prisoner of the Rights, that it had come into power by their grace, and that it could make no move without their nod of approval. While it is true that it held the second largest bloc of seats in the Cortes, it stood almost alone in the center. To ally itself with the Lefts was impossible and even then it could not muster a majority. It must either ally itself with the Rights or create a parliamentary impasse.

Try as one may, it is difficult to see how, in the Spanish political panorama, Señor Lerroux and his party represent anything more than a thirst for power. To achieve it he had campaigned against and obstructed the constituent Cortes; had directed those maneuvers which weakened the Left majority and provoked crises; had given the *coup de grace* to the old Parliament with his decree of dissolution. He and his party were to go to the people, were to be the future arbiters of the Republic. Sterile labor! He had merely opened a passageway for the Rights.

However, it was not out of gratitude that the Rights gave the power to Don Alejandro and his Radicals. The Rights have a determined *política*. They had won the elections in the compromising company of Monarchists—Traditionalists and *Renovación Española*. They needed time to shake off this encumbrance; indeed they have already won the enmity of both these parties by conditionally accepting the Republic. Thus the Lerroux Government is commonly spoken of as a "bridge Cabinet," as a thoroughfare by which the Rights expect to pass into power at the appointed hour. The Lefts, watching the scene with inflamed vision, see a second *política*, a tactic on the part of the Rights to egg the Radicals on to repressive acts against "the masses," thereby achieving the triple end of stirring them up, of making the Radicals odious to them, and finally of stepping into power, at the same time taking the situation as a pretext for establishing some form of dictatorship.

This was the situation which led to the political debate of February 7. In Barcelona the extremists—Communists, Socialists, Peasants, "evolutionary" Anarchists and others—were forming the Workers' Alliance whose frank purpose was the creation of a united revolutionary front. In Madrid revolutionary elements had obtained control of the Socialist party; two of its leaders, Largo Caballero and Indalecio Prieto, both ex-Ministers of the Azaña Government, were making revolutionary speeches, urging the workers and soldiers to revolt, advocating the seizure of gold from the banks.

In the face of this menace the Right parties demanded firmer action on the part of the Government. The extremists and the Lefts were at once convinced that herein was confirmation of their fear that the Rights were out to destroy them. The Minister of Government, Martínez Barrios (the police authority), restive under the cross-fire to which the Cabinet was being subjected, issued a declaration of independence in which he affirmed that the Cabinet stood on its own feet, taking orders from neither the Rights nor the Lefts.

Now came the debate in the Cortes preceded by, as the Spanish papers say, *expectación*. Señor Robles arose to ask whether the Government counted with sufficient forces to dominate the subversive movement then under way, telling it that otherwise it ought to revert to stronger hands. This was an obvious warning that the Rights would take power at once unless they felt reassured. Señor Barrios accepted these requirements without reserve, although saving his face by pointing out that the

subversive speeches were made not only on the Left but on the Right. The Prime Minister, Señor Lerroux, dared Señor Prieto and the other Socialists to repeat the things they had said "in the street." Prieto accepted the dare. He accused the Government of "alliance with the enemy" which was bent on destroying the Republic; the older order, he said, "sprouts with an insolent splendor" and before such a state of affairs, "we pledge ourselves to the revolution."

The debate ended in a vote of confidence for the Government which had capitulated to the demands of the Rights, thus sealing their bondage to them. The net result was that the Rights, under the Gil Robles leadership, had demonstrated their force and advanced toward the moment of taking power while the extremists and the Lefts were more than ever convinced that the Rights desired to give them no room in which to live.

The next day the Government took more stringent police measures in accordance with its pledge and further resorted to such expedients as closing the radio to political orators, keeping a closer watch on the press, and ordering the prosecution of some of the Socialist ex-Ministers. The closing of the radio prevented the broadcast, a few days later, of a speech by Don Manuel Azaña, the ex-Prime Minister, in which he pleaded for the voluntary dissolution of all parties of the Left, including his own, and their replacement by a single Left party with the implication that he would accept the leadership of such a party if called upon to do so. The formation of the One Big Left Party is now being discussed and has its possibilities. Even though the Lefts are in eclipse, it must be remembered that their strength in the Cortes would have been greater had the proportional instead of the majority-minority voting system been employed at the last election. A great deal depends upon the astuteness with which the Rights carry on.

But the widely existing state of mind to which the ex-Premier gave emphasis bodes no good for the spiritual peace of Spain. No doubt it springs largely from that passionate partisanship of the Lefts who themselves showed no quarter when in power and who find it difficult to expect better of their opponents. But the more recent attitude of the Rights gives grounds for uneasiness lest it prove over-ready to use the mailed fist—that same mailed fist that has macerated Spain in past centuries, bringing it no peace. *Hay que pegar*—it is necessary to strike—that has been a fatal Spanish formula for governing. If he could find a better formula, Señor Robles, who approaches the moment of power with a reassuring profession of Christian principles, would perform an inestimable service to his Church and his Spain.

Editor's Note. Since Mr. Fernsworth wrote on February 14, the Lerroux Cabinet fell on the issue of the anti-Catholic activities of his Minister of the Interior, Martínez Barrios, who is Grand Master of the Freemasons (Grand Orient) of Spain. Lerroux was recalled by the President, as noted in this issue's Chronicle, and the situation remains the same as described here.

Violating the NRA

FLOYD ANDERSON

VIOLOGATING NRA agreements has become a national pastime for some industrialists (at one time known as "industrial wizards"). On every side, you hear complaints about the way in which violations are occurring, with presumably no attention being paid to them by the Administrator of the Recovery Act. General Johnson has been exceedingly vociferous in his verbal threats to "crack down," but extremely reluctant, it would appear, to take any real action along that line.

I have come across a few cases here in New York City that seem to indicate the trend of thought among some employers.

One instance is that of a lawyer in downtown New York. He has now instructed his secretary that she must work each day an hour longer than the NRA code allows. If anyone asks her questions, she must say that she comes in at ten in the morning, when she really comes in at nine. And each night she works until six. To whom can she complain? The NRA headquarters has been flooded with complaints, with apparently little attention being paid to most of them.

Then there is the case, well known in the Bronx where I learned of it, of the nationally known chain store. The chain had big advertisements in the metropolitan newspapers when they signed their code, full of figures showing how many more men they have employed, how much more money they would pay out that year in salaries and wages—in other words, they felt that they were Doing Their Part, and had no hesitancy in letting the world (including present and prospective customers) know about it.

That was the public side of it. But there is a private side to it, too. First there was the case of Jimmy. He had worked for them for quite a while, a nice presentable young fellow, from what I saw of him, and he supported his widowed mother with his earnings. He didn't get much—probably eighteen to twenty dollars a week. It wasn't much, perhaps, but the gap between nothing and eighteen a week is very considerable.

And then Jimmy was fired. I have heard conflicting reasons for that. Some say that he was drunk at work. Some said this, and some said that. But the reason couldn't have bulked very large in the eyes of his employers, because very soon Jimmy was back in the store again, missing only a day or two from work. But—Jimmy gets only the minimum wage now, \$15.00 a week.

And, from the stories that the boys at the store freely tell, it worked so successfully with Jimmy that they fired all the others, and then hired them back again. It is a well-thought-out plan, you must admit—and who can do anything about it? Of course, they signed an NRA agreement, but they certainly haven't lived up to the spirit of it. And I haven't yet heard anything about General Johnson cracking down on this chain system.

Another method of violating the NRA agreements, of

which I have heard, shows a little more finesse. It is not so crude as the hiring-after-firing plan. It may be the result of more imagination; and then again, it may be just the result of years and years of anti-social practice. I am inclined to attribute it to the latter. An employer as short sighted as this hasn't enough imagination to think up such a plan.

The method is simple. Merely schedule your employees to the full amount of the NRA maximum-hour scale, but keep your staff always undermanned by two or three. It is unbelievably simple. Obviously the employees want to keep their jobs, and they work at a breakneck speed, which is necessary to keep half-way up to date with their work. And, when you have them working at their fastest and to the ultimate hour-limit of your code agreement—then casually give them a little more work as they are about ready to go home at the end of the day. Just ask them if they mind staying a few minutes late "just today," to get it out. Or just plainly tell them that it is "very important," and must go out that night. And after you have done that a few times, with someone in charge who is sympathetic to your views—it is not long before the whole force is working a half-hour overtime and more each night. On each individual, that represents a gain of three hours or two and a half each week. Just multiply that by the number of employees in your plant to show the net gain.

Now when you have the employees thoroughly accustomed to doing that, start "crabbing" about the work not being done, and then comes the fine hand. The one in charge can always suggest that work be taken home—just to get it cleaned up, don't you know—of course it is entirely voluntary! Eventually the entire plant will be working longer hours than before it went under the NRA code agreement.

I happen to know of one factory in New York City which has signed the code for its industry, under which office employees are to work forty hours, and factory employees thirty-five. The entire plant is supposed to be shut down on Saturdays.

The president of the company, after about a month of operating under the code, suggested that one of the girls in the office come in on Saturday morning, to handle the telephone switchboard and other minor details that might come up. They would give her an afternoon off during the week to compensate for it. They do that, all right. But is that compensation? At the most she gets probably three hours free, but her whole day is ruined. What is there to do? When she gets home, it is three or four o'clock, if she lives any distance from her office, as most New York employees do. Her Saturday is likewise ruined. She must put in four and a half to five hours in the office, with no opportunity to rest or do any of the many things that are planned for a free day.

This company of which I know started with one girl

coming in on Saturdays. Soon two were coming in, and now it has been worked up to the pitch where the whole office force comes in.

The trade association in charge of the code for this industry knows of the practice, but apparently it has been satisfactorily "explained" to them. At least, no action has been taken to stop the violation of the code.

The employees are in an unenviable position. They dare not complain to the NRA. If they do, they are almost certain to be found out, and then where will they be? Discharged, for some cooked-up reason, and with a recommendation calculated to damn them for the rest of their working days. There are ways of giving recommendations that are smooth sounding but yet effectively keep the one "recommended" out of a position. There is such a thing as a black list. If the job is lost under such conditions, it is almost impossible to get another.

A pertinent example is the case of a waiter recently reported in the New York newspapers. He had complained about his employer violating his NRA code by not paying sufficient wages. The waiter finally got the amount of money due him, some fifty dollars, I believe it was, but he lost his job. Now he is unable to get another one. He protests that he is on a black list. It is easy to believe that. It is so easy to answer requests for recommendations by saying that a man is competent but that

he does not "cooperate." And by cooperation, or rather the lack of it, they mean that the worker is not willing for the employing firm, in the words of Pius XI, "to divert business and economic activity entirely to its own arbitrary will and advantages without any regard to the human dignity of the workers, the social character of economic life, social justice, and the common good."

Enforcement of the codes approved is the biggest job that now confronts the National Industrial Recovery Administration. And much, in the welfare and ultimate well-being of the nation, will depend on the way in which Recovery Administrator Johnson meets that job.

To be effective, the NRA agreements must be effectively enforced. Already it is crumbling about the edges because employers—the "chiseling" ones, the doughty General loves to call them—are pinching the frosting off the cake. It is time for someone to slap their fingers, and it is General Johnson's job to do the slapping.

The fireworks must be more than verbal now. A few efficient and well-publicized "crackings-down" will do much more good than twenty loud speeches. And the bigger the violator, the better it will be for the country.

Why not take a crack at that chain grocery store, General? A good example will probably chase into sound territory some of those who are now skating on thin ice.

What Does Dollfuss Want?

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

WHEN Dr. Engelbert Dollfuss, Austria's Chancellor, took luncheon on February 22 with the Anglo-American Press Association of Vienna (composed of British and American correspondents stationed in that city), he succeeded, worn and weary as he was with his terrific struggle against the Socialists, in winning the hearts of even the most captious of his critics. Frederick T. Birchall, correspondent of the New York Times, whose dispatches had shown little enthusiasm for Dollfuss, wrote, after the interview, as follows:

Under such circumstances as those of today's gathering, Chancellor Dollfuss is at his best and there is nothing of the dictator about him. He is democratic and kindly to the last degree; serious and earnest, yet good-humored and frank to a degree unusual in a statesman confronted with the equally frank and unembarrassed questioning of a score of correspondents representing newspapers of all shades of opinion.

And he added:

Dr. Dollfuss undoubtedly has something that is enabling him to emerge little worse from a situation that would have ruined most of the rulers of European States. And in the sterner battle with a stronger foe that is coming, the Nazis, he will need it all.

Dr. Dollfuss obviously impressed his hearers by the earnest tribute that he paid to the courage of the Socialist combatants, who, he said, were not the Socialist workers as a whole, but rather a radical section alone—scarcely ten per cent of the whole party. Even these he hoped to win over; and peace, material and spiritual, would be his aim. At the same time he reiterated his intention to provide the

country with a new Constitution. It was being framed and would be ready in two or three weeks. It was "being drawn neither from Fascist extremes nor Socialist extremes, but with a desire to base it on middle ground between the two." On March 5 Dr. Dollfuss stated that he planned it as a Magna Charta for Austria.

The particular significance of this project lies in Dr. Dollfuss' intention, as announced by him at the Catholic Congress in Vienna, on September 9, 1933:

The present Government has unanimously decided to proceed to the reorganization, in a Christian and German spirit, of the State and of the economic life of our country.

We shall take as the foundation for our constitutional life forms and bases which are so splendidly declared in the Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno." We have the ambition of being the first country actually to answer, in its political constitution, to the appeal of this admirable Encyclical.

Much capital was made in the press over the supposed predominance of Prince Starhemberg, leader of the Heimwehr, with his Fascist ideas, over the more liberal Dollfuss. Nevertheless, in response to the most persistent questioning on this point, the Chancellor denied that there was any ground for rumors of differences between him and the Heimwehr leaders.

Austria, he expected, would ratify the Concordat which had been already signed at the Vatican on June 5, 1933; thus bringing to a felicitous close what had then been inaugurated.

The Chancellor's declaration as to the proposed Consti-

tution, however, might easily give rise to certain misconceptions. Two, in particular, are apt to prevail: that there is available, for Catholic-minded legislators, some kind of a model Papal constitution; and that the corporative element, which the Chancellor includes as necessarily belonging to anything built upon the "Quadragesimo Anno," implies Fascism or State absorption of industry. Neither of these propositions is correct.

Such a "model Constitution" does not exist. The Church has not altered her attitude of indifference to the various forms of Government, democratic, monarchical, or other structures. These she leaves to each nation to determine in accordance with its historical traditions and internal needs. As Cardinal Pacelli, Papal Secretary of State, observed on November 12, 1933, to the Roman pilgrimage of the Catholic young men's associations of Germany: "What concrete form of State may be best adapted in the course of time to the internal laws of life for the different nations, is a question which in itself the Church does not touch." The Church and the Encyclical are concerned with the conditions necessary for any State, any form of government, European or otherwise, to function if it is to keep within the bounds of Christian principles.

What these principles might be, as applied to a genuinely Christian State, was indicated in five propositions enumerated in the Vatican City organ, the *Osservatore Romano*, for September 16, 1933. Briefly they may be summed up:

1. The Christian State must be an ethical State: it must place religion and morals at the head of all social values and must give to this recognition an actual institutional, normative expression.
2. The Christian State must divorce itself completely from the doctrinaire Liberalism condemned in the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX, a liberalism which admits no restraint to the free play of human personality.
3. It must be non-Socialistic, maintaining the principle of private property.
4. It must establish the principle of authority in Government; but this does not mean necessarily the abrogation of an elective, representative system of government. ("We reject," said Dollfuss on September 11 in his discourse to the Patriotic Front, "the system of unification and terror. We look for the social, Christian, German State of Austria on a corporative basis, under a strong and authoritative government. Authority is not arbitrary, authority is ordered force, it is direction by men conscious of their responsibility, disinterested and ready to sacrifice themselves." Dollfuss on various occasions has expressly disclaimed a dictatorship.)
5. It should have a corporative character, and thus be distinguished from individualistic Liberalism, from communistic Socialism, and from State capitalism.

What then is this "corporative basis" of the Christian State? It is not something artificially created, but is a natural evolution from economic activity directed to a rational—and therefore ethical and socially profitable—end. As Father Gundlach, S.J., stated to a group of Ger-

man workmen at the Catholic Congress in Essen, Germany, in 1932:

Economic life evolves naturally around the different products. So it is natural for the members of an economic society to group themselves around each product, whether they are occupied in its production or its marketing, whether they direct or carry out the labor involved, whether they engage in the instruction or the studies that are thereby concerned. Thus . . . they naturally form a professional corporation.

The Encyclical, therefore, regards the corporations, or professional groupings, as natural, as the family is a natural grouping. As the individual in his personal life is associated with the family, so in his larger, or social and economic life, he will naturally be associated with the larger family of the corporations. These, as is pointed out by the Italian law establishing corporations, of January 18, 1934 (*Legge sull'ordinamento corporativo*), fulfil a twofold function, social and economic. Socially, they do away with class warfare by establishing collaboration between employers and workers; economically, they bring the production of material goods under discipline.

It would be a mistake, however, to confine the corporative idea to the economic sphere alone. Austrian publicists have been particularly emphasizing this point; for instance, Dr. Joseph A. Tzöbl, general secretary of the Christian-Social Volksverband, of Vienna (*Schönere Zukunft*, October 18, 1933):

The economically active circles of the people are not the only ones which come into consideration as *Stände* (estates, or corporations). . . . The representatives of the Church, of intellectual life, of the "free" professions, in short the representatives of world of religious, moral, and generally cultural elements in the nation should be recognized as "estates" and be fittingly represented in all future directive and representative bodies.

These corporative groups, or estates, are in no wise to function as mere branches of the Government. The concept of the "totalitarian" State, in which the corporations are set up from the top down, and exist merely as commissary agencies for carrying out the will, economic or otherwise, or a governmental dictatorship, is alien to the Papal, as well as to the Dollfuss concept of society. Such an idea is the application in the economic order of the dictatorship in the mental order described by Father Parsons in his article on "Totalitarianism," in *AMERICA* for November 18, 1933.

As was pointed out in a thorough discussion of the topic by Dr. Albert Hackelsberger, before the Görres Society in Fribourg, in 1933, the Encyclical does not speak of a State "formed out of professional groups. It abstains from declaring as right and just those professional groups which are constituted by the State." The Encyclical looks upon professional groups as natural social institutions. While they form a part of human society itself, the State moves above society in a directing position, supplying that unification and coordination of activities which the professional groups, of whatever sort, cannot provide for themselves. "The corporative system cannot be conceived without a strong and stable government, and one independent as well" (E. Mathon. *Bulletin des Industriels*, January, 1934). "Note the difference: the Socialist State absorbs the individual life, in order to administer

it; the corporative State develops it and harmonizes it with other, higher interests, but never absorbs it" (Joaquín Azpiazu. *Razón y Fe*, February, 1934).

Such a constitution would be in marked contrast to that system with which Austria, monarchy or republic, has been plagued since the days of Joseph II, whereby the Government mixed in everything, undertook to manage everything, yet was notoriously weak and bureaucratic. Yet it would be in equally marked contrast to the dictatorial scheme, Fascist or Socialist.

According to Dr. Hugo Diwald, of Vienna, in *Der Christliche Ständestaat* for December, 1933, the Dollfuss Constitution will be marked by the following features. Party government will be abolished, or greatly limited. The "estates" or professional groups will be partly autonomous, administering their own affairs, partly working in cooperation with a representative body elected by the people. There will be, therefore, no "corporatizing" (*Verzünftigung*) of the entire life of the nation; no management of Church and State by the corporations. State politics and economico-social politics will be clearly distinguished, although associated; each being represented by its respective branch of the Legislature. The professional groups, however, will be truly representative, the main divisions being: intellectual workers, government employes, agriculture and forestry, industry and crafts, business and commerce, domestic service.

Will the workers' rights be safeguarded under such a system, for instance, as to collective bargaining? Dr. Dollfuss declared in his speech of November 11: "We shall never impair the vital and fundamental rights of our workers. On the contrary, a Christian State should above all things give satisfaction to what the workers demand." Will the fears expressed as to the corporative system in the *Osservatore Romano* for that same date prove true, that the "political man," the primacy of political interests will simply be substituted for the primacy of business interests which have governed the world under the individualistic system? Dr. Dollfuss' answer to these forebodings is his own conviction that "the faults of 150 years of our history must be repaired," and that the whole nation must collaborate in doing so. Whether his accomplishment can measure up to his ideals will be the interesting lesson of 1934.

PORTRAITS

When, in the portrait gallery of my heart,

I contemplate those few great faces seen

By me but once, and painted there by art

Of my quick adoration (—all serene,

Those faces, yet all vivid with the sense

Of splendid triumph over many tears,

Rich with the fullness of experience,

Strong with the beauty of refining years):

Kreisler and Paderewski and old saints

Grown white-haired in sweet service of their faiths—

These are so lovely that my spirit faints

And all my thoughts turn pale and wan as wraiths,

Dreaming how much more beautiful must be

The Face men glimpsed and loved by Galilee. . . .

DOROTHY HOBSON.

The Birthplace of St. Patrick

JOHN W. MORAN, S.J.

ST. PATRICK tells us in his "Confession" that he was born in the *vicus* or town of Bonavem Taberniae. (Various readings are given for this town in different manuscripts.) Scholars have given much time to research in an effort to locate this *vicus*. Though France, Scotland, and England have each laid claims to possess within their boundaries the birthplace of the Apostle of the Irish, the claims of France can be dismissed easily. In the first place, Muirchu, the earliest biographer of the Saint (he began his work sometime before 699 A.D.), identifies Bonavem Taberniae with a place called Ventre, which was *haud procul a mari nostro*, that is, it was near the Irish Channel.

Moreover, St. Patrick himself in his "Confession" says, "And again after many years I was in Britain with my relatives, who received me as a son" (Migne, P. L. 53, 806). Later on, while carrying on his sacred ministry among the Irish, he uses the expression, "wherefore, then, even if I wished to leave them and proceed to Britain . . . as to my native land and kindred, and not only that, but to proceed even as far as Gaul to visit the brethren" (Migne 810). Now the Britain of which St. Patrick wrote was not Brittany. For the Saint died during the last half of the fifth century. At that time, Brittany was still called by its Latin name, Armorica. The term Brittany did not come into use until some time after the Britons fled to Gaul in order to escape the Saxon invaders—in other words, not until after the Saint's death.

St. Patrick in his "Confession" tells us that his grandfather was a priest and that his father Calpornius was a deacon. He also gives us the information that his family had a small villa (*villula*), near the village of Bonavem Taberniae and that it was at this villa that he was captured. (Migne, 801.) In his "Epistle against Corotaticus," the Saint gives us this additional information in regard to himself: "I was well born according to the flesh. My father was a decurion." He also tells us that his Irish captors harried the men servants and the maid servants of his father's house (Migne, 816).

Therefore, the Saint's father was a decurion, that is, a member of the town senate, for (1) the Saint was well born according to the flesh; (2) his father had a *villula* or a country residence; and (3) an establishment of men servants and maid servants. The word *decurion* among the Romans also meant a military officer. But a military decurion was an officer of the lowest grade; he commanded only ten soldiers. If St. Patrick's father was a military decurion the Saint could hardly have said, "I was well born according to the flesh. My father was a decurion."

From these facts we can argue with the aid of modern archeological discoveries in attempting to find the birthplace of St. Patrick. Whether the Saint's father was also a deacon does not vitiate our argument. However, we may suggest in passing that he was not a deacon. The word *diaconem* in the the first chapter of the "Confession" is probably a copyist's error for *decurionem*. In no other place in St. Patrick's writings is there any word

or context which brings out any connection with his father and the diaconate.

Secondly, Pope Siricius in 385 extended to the whole Latin Church the thirty-third canon of the Council of Elvira which imposed celibacy upon the three higher orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, and commanded those who were married to abstain from intercourse with their wives under pain of deposition. Now St. Patrick was born in 387 or 389. This decree would not militate against the fact of St. Patrick's grandfather being a priest.

However, as we have said before, it is immaterial to our argument whether or not Calpurnius was a deacon. He certainly was a decurion or a member of the town senate. He belonged to that part of Britain where the Roman civil rule flourished, where there were villas and establishments of men servants and maid servants. Therefore his son was born not only south of the Antonine Wall, but even *south of Hadrian's Wall*. The late Professor Haverfield, the great authority on Roman Britain, has pointed out that there were two distinct divisions of Roman Britain; the northern and western uplands, occupied by troops, and the eastern and southern lowlands which contained nothing but civil life. He says: "We shall not find much trace of Romanization in the uplands. There neither towns existed *nor villas* [italics mine]. Northwards, no town or country house has been found beyond the neighborhood of Aldborough [Isurium], some fifteen miles north-west of York" ("Romanization of Roman Britain," p. 24).

These archeological discoveries, which are confirmed by the "Antonine Wall Report," issued by the Glasgow Archeological Society (1899), upset the opinion of Cardinal Moran and other eminent Patrician scholars who support the claims of Dumbarton (Scotland), as the birthplace of the Saint. Dumbarton is *more than 150 miles north of York*. As Professor Bury, one of the greatest authorities in this matter, points out, "the Rock of Clyde" (Dumbarton), in the last part of the fourth century, "is the last place we should expect to find the villula of a Roman decurion."

St. Patrick's birthplace therefore is in some part of Britain which corresponds to the Roman *domi* rather than to *militiae*. Can we identify Bonavem Taberniae? We can with a high degree of probability. Muirchu gives us a valuable hint. He says: "We have ascertained repeatedly that this town is unquestionably Ventre." He adds, moreover, as we have seen, that it was *haud procul a mari nostro*—that is, it was near the Irish Channel.

Now we have to look in the southwestern part of England for Ventre, a place which would have villas and the trappings of Roman urban life. Ventre is most likely. "Venta" (Silurum), the modern Caerwent, not far distant from the estuary of the Severn, *haud procul a mari nostro*.

The "Excavations of Caerwent" (1907-1912) in "Archeologica," Vols. 61, 62, and 63, make very interesting reading. The foundation of Venta is placed as early as a period between 80 and 85 A.D. It had a Curia (and hence decurions) from at least the third century.

It had guilds of tradesmen, a Forum, and a Basilica. There are evidences of central heating, a stone amphitheater (the only one yet excavated in Britain), while one of the private houses shows all the appurtenances of the bath such as would be found in the Imperial City. In other words, Roman civilization had deeply impregnated the private and public life of Venta. It is no wonder then that Dr. Helena Concannon and Dr. Eoin MacNeill have selected Caerwent as the birthplace of the Apostle of the Irish.

In any case, modern discoveries have established two truths: (1) the popular tradition in favor of Dumbarton must yield to scientific evidence; and (2) if Caerwent is not the birthplace of St. Patrick, it was in some part of Romanized Britain near the Irish Channel that the Saint was born.

Sociology

That Child-Labor Amendment!

JOHN WILTBYE

THE graduate student was angry. I just love graduate students, particularly when they get human.

"It's shameful," he said. "Think of those millions of little children working in mines and fields."

I find it rather hard to think of millions of anything. To me, "millions" is just a word that they use in Federal appropriations. So I thought of one little child at the work in the fields, although he is no longer very little. He is six feet and two inches in height, and he is twenty-six years old, but in 1915 he was nine years younger and about two inches shorter. His father was trying to force him through college, but Bill didn't want to stay in college and I think the Dean agreed with him. Bill's father consulted me; his tone and mien were those of a parent fighting to keep a dear one out of jail, with scant hope of success.

"If the boy doesn't want to go to college," I asked, "what does he want to do?"

"He wants to go to work on my farm!"

Bill, senior, I should say, is a man of considerable means and properties, one of which is a fine farm. He could not see the wisdom of my advice, to let his son do what he wanted to do, until the faculty, by unanimous vote, sent Bill, Jr., home. Then Bill went down to the farm to begin his education, and today he has it, along with a small family, and one of the few farms in that region that pay. He was not made for the training some get in college, but for the soil and the skies and all manner of living things. Reviewing Bill, I couldn't waste much sympathy on boys toiling on the farms.

"Oh, yes. I beg your pardon. But you were talking about the millions on farms and in mines. Aren't your figures a bit high? Just reach for that World Almanac, will you, please. You can correct me, but I think the total number of children up to fifteen years of age gainfully employed is only about 678,000. At any rate, it's

a lot smaller than those millions you were throwing around."

"It's not possible. Are these figures correct?"

"I don't know. I never could count very well. But the Census people give them out, and perhaps they're approximately correct."

I am tiring a bit of all this talk about cruelty to children, and the need of the Great Father at Washington coming to their rescue, and I suspect that the country is also tiring of it. At least, it did not make much impression on the legislatures of Texas and Massachusetts which within the last month have rejected the Amendment. In Kentucky, after listening to an emotional outburst from the Secretary of Labor, the General Assembly declined even to consider the measure. It might have been better had the Assembly rejected the amendment outright, but possibly the members did not wish even to seem to be impolite to a lady. A private poll showed that had a vote been taken, the Amendment would have been rejected overwhelmingly.

Now if a graduate student can be wrong (the very supposition seems impious) what can be expected of the dry wood? Senator Wagner, for instance, has been at pains on more than one occasion to inform us that the Amendment prohibits nothing at all, nothing at all. It merely gives Congress authority to prohibit, and—does he wish us to infer?—Congress will not prohibit. Well, we were not assuming that the Amendment proposed to invest Ghengis Khan, for instance, or Charlie Ross, with any authority, but surely it cannot have escaped the notice of so astute a legislator that this sweeping grant of power to Congress in so delicate a matter is precisely what many of us condemn.

Nothing less than a national crisis, not to be met in any other way, could justify this organic change in the Constitution. But child labor of an objectionable character is not so extensive as to create a crisis. With the exception of one State, and the possible exception of three or four others, this sort of child labor hardly exists. In the certain exception, the citizens, instead of demanding that the legislature pass appropriate legislation, are demanding that the legislature approve the Amendment. That is on a par with an Amendment to suppress all jails, except Federal jails, on the ground that a notorious criminal in Indiana, one Dillinger, by name, setting courtesy at defiance, broke out of a lady sheriff's new burglar-proof jail. When the States fail in their duties, let us try, just for a novelty, to find some remedy, other than a Federal Amendment.

In a letter to William D. Guthrie, published in the *New York Times*, for March 5, Elihu Root expresses his dissent from the Amendment on the ground that it is "a repudiation of the principle of local self-government upon which our system rests." Mr. Root adds that in a time when this principle is subjected to great strain, it is particularly necessary that it be defended, to the end that our constitutional form of government may survive. He writes:

The necessary expansion of Federal control over inter-State and foreign commerce, over currency and banking, over post-

offices and means of transportation, the unlimited control of Congress over vast expenditures of money raised by Federal taxation, have of necessity built up a vast Federal bureaucracy (leaving quite out of the question the present emergency control) by the side of which State authority tends to lose its independence of action. This necessary process will inevitably continue, and it becomes continually of more vital importance to the maintenance of our system of government, that the authority, the dignity, and the independence of action in all local affairs of our separate States, shall be maintained and insisted upon.

But as the proposed Amendment obviously increases Federal centralization, and in a matter much more important than currency and banking, it tends to create a vast super-Government of which the States will be little more than geographical divisions. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has said that under the Amendment the Government could send Federal inspectors into every home and family in the land, to find out what anyone under eighteen years of age was doing, and whether he was doing anything which Congress had either limited, regulated, or prohibited. From this opinion, Dr. Henry N. McCracken, president of Vassar, dissents. "Any regulation would be a regulation not of the home," he said in an address in New York on March 4, "but of the labor of children for wages."

Like so many men of his school, Dr. McCracken is not familiar with the Amendment; his remarks were not deliberately intended to mislead. A mere glance suffices to show that there is no reference in the Amendment to "the labor of children for wages," and we know from its history that this and all similar phrases were studiously excluded from it. Hence Dr. McCracken's case against Dr. Butler falls to the ground. Dr. Butler does not affect to know the exact lengths to which Congress would go under the Amendment. But everyone knows the disgraceful travesty on government created by Congress through the Volstead Act, the "five-and-ten" Act, and other measures, which raised up swarms of spies and pursuivants all over the country, and increased drunkenness, lawlessness, disorder and disrespect for authority in every State in the Union.

For such remnants of objectionable child labor as yet remain, the people of the States have many remedies at hand. One is the uniform child-labor law approved in 1930 by the American Bar Association. There is no need to call for Federal intervention; in government, "let Washington do it" is a fatal delusion. The proposed Amendment is plainly, to quote from a resolution adopted by the American Bar Association last August, "an invasion by the Federal Government of a field in which the rights of the individual States and of the family are, and should remain, paramount." What it plans is an organic change in the Constitution which shifts responsibilities and duties from the several States to the control of political majorities in Congress. As a characteristic of our political mind, the tendency to escape from duty and to evade responsibility has grown to an extent that is truly alarming. No stronger check could be placed upon this disintegrating tendency than the rejection of the alleged child-labor Amendment. It is to be hoped that no legislature will fail to examine it in all its phases.

Education

False Weights and Measures

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

ALITTLE more than a quarter of a century ago, in April, 1908, a committee appointed to study certain problems in secondary and higher education, agreed upon the definition of a unit to be used, primarily, in measuring college-entrance requirements. "A unit represents a year's study in any subject in a secondary school," the committee reported, "constituting approximately a quarter of a full year's work." The definition was published in the fourth Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation, and within a short time was generally accepted as a convenient and accurate standard of measurement.

But dissatisfaction was soon expressed by men and women whose years of practical experience in the classroom gave authority to their judgments. Convenient the new standard might be, but satisfactory it was not, particularly since any fifteen units attested to by an approved school were accepted as certifying that the student was fit for college. That, they thought, was very much like putting the tuition fee at 100 coins, without reference to the fact that dimes as well as dollars are coins. It was clear that many schools, and probably as many colleges, were applying the unit in a rigid and purely formalistic fashion to the achievements, real or apparent, of the young idea. Moreover, the unit was far from accurate when employed to rate the student's intellectual ability, or even as a means of demonstrating that he was prepared to use profitably the opportunities offered him at college.

Despite criticism, the new measurement held its place. Thousands of high-school graduates, every one of them bearing fifteen units in his hands or hers, knocked at the academic gates, and for most of them the gates swung wide. Once inside the portals, a fair majority of them, if recent strictures on American education have any basis whatever in fact, promptly gave evidence of their inability or their unwillingness to devote themselves to academic pursuits. "That the school and university system in this country is in a chaotic state, educationally as well as financially," said Dr. Henry C. Morrison, professor of education at the University of Chicago, addressing the National Education Association on February 26, "scarcely requires demonstration." For this condition, scored even more strongly some years ago by William S. Larned in a comparative study of higher education in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, the craze for measurements which grew into an insanity in this country, cannot, of course, be held wholly responsible. The excesses are themselves the outgrowth of what Dr. Morrison has styled "the brazen cult of experimentalism" in American education.

Time, however, begins to justify the earlier rebels, and that the unit is no longer a sacred oriflamme is a sign of progress. If we are not precisely sure what should

replace it, to know that it is not the last word of immutable wisdom is a gain. In the current Carnegie Report, William S. Larned and the late Henry Suzzallo not only admit, but strongly assert, that the unit is one of many educational expedients which have become "obsolete." Once regarded as "satisfactory" and "liberal," they state, we now recognize that it is inaccurate and wooden, and that as "a revealing standard of performance" by the student, it is grossly misleading. The Foundation suggests as a point of departure for a scientific study of this subject what has frequently been recommended in these pages, namely, "a system of continuous individual records, including information about every phase of student interest and accomplishment."

But the unit is not the sole "educational expedient" that should be marked for reform, if possible, otherwise for destruction. Two other expedients, now generally accepted, are equally false as educational standards. Of these, one refers to the qualifications of college teachers, and the other to the minimum endowment of the college.

It is easy to understand why these expedients were adopted. It is equally easy to see that today they are used in some parts of the country in an extreme manner which hinders rather than helps the progress of higher education. Today every standardized college must have a certain proportion of faculty members who have taken the doctorate, the supposition being that one who has specialized for a number of years will not only know his subject, but will be able to teach it well. The ranking professors and the heads of departments are chosen from the doctors alone, although some of the older Eastern universities, especially in recent years, have felt free to disregard this limitation. Jefferson Fletcher, of Columbia, and the late Barrett Wendell, of Harvard, are two well-known examples of men whose lack of the doctorate did not dim their academic prestige.

It is admitted that no man should go into the classroom of a college unless his fitness for the work he proposes to do has been satisfactorily tested. But it cannot be asserted, still less imposed upon the college as a final standard, that the doctorate is the sole satisfactory test. Exceptions cut both ways far too frequently to allow that arbitrary assumption. We have doctors who cannot teach; doctors whose zeal in research was languishing when they received their degree, and died soon afterward; and doctors whose lack of administrative ability is so clear that you would with hesitancy put them in charge of a peanut stand. And we have all known men, masters of research and most stimulating teachers, whose highest academic grade was the degree of bachelor—or who had no degree at all.

Who that met the late Father John C. Reville, S.J., for years an Associate Editor of this Review, could ever

forget him? Trained from his youth in the Romance languages, Father Reville wrote French with a purity and spoke it with an eloquence which won the marveling applause of so competent a listener as Msgr. Baudrillart, Rector of the Catholic Institute at Paris. His familiarity with the language and literature of Italy and Spain was only a little less close, and in the classical languages, he was a scholar of a fashion long departed. This training, together with his mastery of English, would have made him an admirable professor of Romance languages and literature, yet under modern collegiate standards Father Reville could not have qualified. In none of the subjects, Latin, Greek, French, and English, which he had taught with admirable success for many years, had he won the doctorate!

To Father Reville, I could add not a few of my own old professors and many men and women whom I have met in my college wanderings. Were all rare exceptions? Possibly, but not probably; if they were, exception to the rule should be made for them. Let us have doctors by all means, young men and women who have devoted years to study and research, but let them keep out of the college unless they are doctors in fact as well as in academic designation. At the same time, if there is no place in the standardized college for a qualified man without the doctorate, then our current standard is absurd. The gown does not make the doctor any more than the habit makes the monk.

Not less unreasonable is the requirement that every college have a minimum endowment of \$500,000. One might as well insist that no man can marry and bring up a family on less than \$5,000 per year. Some men are poor on \$50,000 a year, and many are able to maintain themselves and their families quite comfortably on the twentieth part of that sum. Colleges do not differ much from men. If a college is to be a showplace, or a sort of museum in which professors offer bizarre courses, good for publicity, but out of place in an educational institution, an endowment of at least \$500,000 may be necessary. But if it is from first to last an academic organization, devoted solely to the intellectual, moral, and religious welfare of the student, and is in charge of men and women to whom education is not primarily a means of making a living, its financial demands may well be more moderate.

In some parts of the country, this minimum endowment is at this moment demanded with a ferocity—I can use no other word—which hints the existence of other motives than a desire to improve collegiate standards. At this time of universal financial depression, the standardizing body might with equal reason demand an endowment of \$500,000,000. One institution, recently refused a place on the list of fully accredited colleges, is conducted by a Congregation of Sisters which has engaged in educational work with notable success for considerably more than a century. The college in question meets all the required standards in equipment, and in the number of teachers with the master's degree and the doctorate. It has, in fact, a larger proportion of doctors and masters than the local fully accredited secular university, and its

extension courses are eagerly sought by teachers, non-Catholics as well as Catholics. Both the State university and the State's department of education have accredited it fully. The quality of the work it is doing is admitted to be high. Its sole fault is that its endowment is considerably less than \$500,000, and until this educational scandal is repaired, it cannot be fully accredited by the standardizing board.

Unreason could hardly go farther. Unfortunately, this is a stupidity which is generously fostered by most of our accrediting boards. This particular board is governed by the theory that without an endowment an institution cannot do satisfactory work in higher education. But when an institution shows that it has done, and is doing, satisfactory work, theory should yield to fact. This standardizing board insists brazenly, however, that in the face of theory, facts are irrelevant.

Administered by small men, rules and regulations tend to destroy the very interests which they were established to protect. We have no better instance of the extent to which a rigid formalism has replaced intelligence than the condition of education in the United States. Our boards allow "credit" for agronomy and tap dancing, for leather work and for swimming. Then they try to destroy a college of proved worth, because it has an endowment less than \$500,000.

With Scrip and Staff

JUST what started my two friends, DeSoto Rogers and Willy Lewis, discoursing on the Passion of Christ, I do not know, unless it were the season of the year, when this great Mystery occupies the central place in the ceremonies of the Church. DeSoto, being an educated man, was impressed by what he had seen of Catholic services; and turned to his younger friend Lewis for explanation. Lewis' equipment, it must be confessed, was not ample. Still he was a regular church attendant; and in the moments he could spare from his long hours clerking in the bank, he did a bit of reading on doctrinal matters. Their conversation, to my recollection, ran somewhat as follows.

DESOTO: There is one element, Willy, in the services of your Church which makes me frankly uncomfortable.

WILLY: What is it? Too many genuflections?

DESOTO: No; it is the emphasis laid upon the Passion of Christ.

WILLY: What's your objection to that?

DESOTO: I do not like the sight of so much suffering. I believe that our religion should be something to encourage us; to cheer us. We ought to lay the stress on life, not on death.

WILLY: You are not one of those New History fans, are you, who want to turn life into a Caravan?

DESOTO: Not that bad. But I do feel a serious difficulty.

WILLY: Well; look at me. There is nothing mystical in my make-up. Yet I get an immense benefit from the

thought of the Passion. And I have no more love for suffering than you have.

DESOTO: But you are *used* to these thoughts, Willy. You were brought up that way.

WILLY: Suppose I was—though in point of fact I was not. I had to work out my religion myself. But even if I were thus brought up, I should have sloughed it all off years ago, if it hadn't helped me. Guess again.

DESOTO: Does the Passion explain anything?

WILLY: It explains that which all men, without exception, sooner or later crave above all things to have explained: the mystery of suffering: of that kind of suffering which seems useless.

DESOTO: But Christ's Passion, as I see it, is the story of a failure.

WILLY: Just so. We all want to know how to find any reason in failure; particularly when that failure brings agony with it. Do you see?

DESOTO: I can see how it brings some comfort. It is a wonderful thing to see anyone suffer for his convictions as did Jesus of Nazareth. He was a real martyr to His beliefs. And that means a lot to me when I find myself opposed and contradicted.

WILLY: Christ was no "martyr to His beliefs," in the sense that you understand that, DeSoto. He died to witness to the truth that He *knew*, being Truth Himself. That's quite different from suffering for a mere persuasion. However, let's get to the point. You know that man Sheed, who has done so much for the Catholic Evidence Guild work in London?

DESOTO: I have heard you talk of him.

WILLY: Father Jude showed me an article he wrote recently in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, a monthly for the clergy. In that article he says that one of the things that most holds the attention of any crowd of people, when they hear Catholic Doctrine explained, is to learn that Christ is God. They are tremendously interested, when you tell them the story of the Gospel, to learn that *that is the way* that God actually behaved, when He decided to become a man and live on earth like the rest of us.

DESOTO: What has that to do with suffering?

WILLY: Because there is nothing that can possibly be thought of more interesting, than to learn how God, the Creator of the world, will act when He Himself has to suffer from His own and in His own creation.

DESOTO: But is that *our* suffering?

WILLY: It *is* our suffering; and that is just the point. In the Passion you see that God has got Himself, so to speak, just into our own most characteristic situations, save those that mean sin.

DESOTO: But could He feel that it is useless, as I do when things go at their worst? He knew the answer; and we do not.

WILLY: He did *feel* that it was useless; even though He did *know* the answer. When the whole business went black for Him there in the Garden of Olives he had the *full* feeling of uselessness. The knowledge that He had of the Divine Plan through it all did not help him one bit. It was in another part of His mind; and in the part

that we know, He was just laid flat, as you were the day you lost your job on the Welfare Board. Only a million times more so.

DESOTO: That's a tremendous thought. If I could grasp it, I could face a thousand failures. It is the lack of just that understanding of Christ that makes our Protestant religion so spineless and feeble. You know the report on "The Education of American Ministers," which has just come from the Institute of Social and Religious Research, in New York. According to this report, "There is an excess of at least 85,000 feeble churches (in the United States), which are unable to support the full-time services of either a trained or untrained minister." And it tells us that only ten or thirteen per cent of Protestant white churches have enough members (about 350) to support adequately a well-trained minister." Those people who have fallen away from us, long for that suffering Divinity, whom you are fortunate enough to know. Our critics—now themselves in disrepute—have destroyed Him in the minds of many. But I still have a difficulty.

WILLY: You will need a dictionary for your difficulties, DeSoto. Let's have it.

DESOTO: I can see how we can be tremendously interested, moved, transformed by the thought that God our Creator had our troubles: was mocked, lied about, tortured, and finally paid the full penalty of death. But was He as much *man* as He was God, in the Gospel story, which is that which you use in your worship? You know that the Russian writer Merezhkovsky says that we must go outside of the Gospels, and draw from the legends, in order to get the really *human* Christ.

WILLY: I don't know those legends. But he is wrong there. The Christ of the Gospels is human even though Divine. The Christ of the Passion is human. His sufferings are not just a lot of happenings, strung together without plan. In His Passion Christ acts: in one great action, which is to do the Will of His Father.

DESOTO: So you would say that this might be taken as the Leitmotif of the Passion: the key, as it were, to the character of Christ.

WILLY: Not quite so simply, I guess. But I do think, DeSoto, that if you start with that you will begin to find your way into that Mystery. Study what Christ does; and you will better understand what He is.

DESOTO: And then I may learn something of what I am myself.

WILLY: When you get that far, old man, you and I can talk.

THE PILGRIM.

PARADOX

How strange and foolish is this love
That sets my pulses throbbing,
Now with a joyous ecstasy
And now with sobbing.

I cannot bear such cruel pain
Nor such tumultuous gladness.
Love is familiar, love is wise,
And love is madness.

KENTON KILMER.

Literature

Charles Kingsley, Warrior and Emotionalist

EVERETT J. CONWAY

THE one-hundredth anniversary of the great Oxford Movement has brought from the press many books and articles on the influence which Cardinal Newman and his colleagues exerted on the religious life of England. To Catholics it might prove of interest to glance for a few moments at the personality and genius of the man whose violent attacks on the integrity of Newman evoked the brilliant "Apologia."

Charles Kingsley to most Catholics is the embodiment of bigotry, violence, and abusiveness. Yet this is not the complete or the impartial picture of the man. One recalls him as a warm-hearted advocate of the Chartist movement, the fiery denouncer of the oppressors of the poor, and the indefatigable expounder of the rights of labor. After denouncing from his pulpit one day the greed and heartlessness of the rich, he was openly rebuked by the dean from the very same pulpit.

It was not, however, as a preacher that Kingsley made his influence so potent in his day; for the man had none of the natural gifts so necessary for the successful orator. He was very tall, very lean, with a scraggly beard and ungainly manner. His voice was thin and piping, and his gestures ludicrously awkward. Neither was his great influence due to the thought and wisdom of his writings, for the most cursory examination of his works reveals him as a superficial thinker and emotionalist, who expressed in vivid and splendid language the deep-seated, religious prejudices of his race. Yet with all his contempt for logic and his inability to probe deeply into the subject matter which he purported to discuss, he had in no mean measure the ability to write powerfully, nobly, and beautifully. Who that has read his "Greek Heroes," the delight of every schoolboy, has not thrilled at its rich and gorgeous imagery, its splendid declamation and its swift narrative, almost Homeric in its simplicity?

Still, it will not be for the beauty of the "Greek Heroes" nor for the winsome charm of the "Water Babies" that Kingsley will be remembered among Catholics, but for his brutal assault on the character of the scholarly and retiring Newman. Yet, amazing as it may seem to many Catholics, unfamiliar with the Protestant concept of the Newman-Kingsley controversy, it is Newman who is regarded in that concept as being brutal and unkind, and Kingsley who is considered the fine English gentleman, victim of the genius of a clever "Roman" casuist.

Hugh Kingsmill, a popular English writer, in his "An Anthology of Invective and Abuse," writes of the Newman-Kingsley controversy in a manner which may prove surprising to many Catholics, but not so to those familiar with the Anglican apologetic. Kingsmill says:

The famous quarrel between Kingsley and Newman, the main stages of which are set forth below, is always held to have ended

in a complete victory for Newman. This verdict entirely in Newman's favor is very much exaggerated. In the first place, it cannot be denied that Kingsley by his muddled handling of his case conclusively demonstrated the soundness of his implied position, that a Protestant Englishman and gentleman was no match for a Catholic priest in verbal dialectics. "The Tongues," according to the Catholics, "were," Kingsley had suggested, "given to men as claws to cats and horns to bulls, simply for the purposes of offense and defense." Father Newman's handling of Kingsley did nothing to disprove this accusation.

How long will this distorted view of Kingsley continue to befuddle the issue and make it appear that a "Protestant English gentleman," mistaken in his view of a clever "Roman" casuist, was abusively treated after having apologized as a true English gentleman, for having misunderstood his opponent?

Of all the writers of a race well known for its virility and pugnacity, Kingsley was the peer of any in aggressiveness and combativeness. Too impatient to observe accurately, and congenitally incapable of the logical process, he rushed headlong into all opponents, snorting and stamping and goring with gusto. What he did not understand he despised. His philosophy was derived from Carlyle, but he was far less noble in his vision of perfection than the sage of Chelsea. The Scottish philosopher glorified strength and ruthlessness of mind, but Kingsley extolled sheer, physical power. All his heroes are abounding in physical vitality and are miracles of physical perfection. The gentle, pensive, reflective soul, who has contributed so many gems of wisdom to the world's treasure house of thought, he detests. Comparing Shelley and Byron in one of his innumerable wrong-headed criticisms, he writes of Shelley as being "lewd" and a "satyr," while the ungoverned Byron is let off in the following fashion—

If Byron sinned more desperately and violently, it was done under the temptations of rank, wealth, disappointed love, and the impulse of the animal nature, to which Shelley's passions were "As moonlight unto sunlight and as water unto wine."

Byron is a sturdy peer, proud of his bull-neck and his boxing, who kept bears and bull dogs and drilled Greek ruffians at Missolonghi and had no objection to a pot of beer; and who might, if he had been reformed, have made a gallant English gentleman; while Shelley, if once his intense self-opinion had deserted him, would probably have ended in Rome as an Oratorian or a Passionist.

Kingsley, like every emotionalist, was quick to anger and struck out at what his heated mind conjured up as a menace to humanity. Of all the victims of monomania, literature affords no more pathetic example than this good-hearted but bull-headed warrior. The one obsession of his life, the one specter that stalked him night and day was "Romanism"—that terrible ecclesiastical tyranny, the embodiment of all that was vile and degrading in the religious life!

Writing to a young friend who was on the verge of joining the Catholic Church, Kingsley displays in a few paragraphs, not only his boiling prejudices, but that powerful, vigorous, and illogical style which was such a part of his very mental make-up. He says:

I have just heard from Charles Mansfield to my inexpressible grief, that you are inclined to join the Roman Communion and, at the risk of being called impertinent, I cannot but write my whole heart to you. . . . Believe me, I am no bigot. I shall not

trouble you with denunciations of the "scarlet woman." I cannot but regard with awe, at least, if not with reverence, a form of faith which God thinks good enough still for one half (though it be the more brutal, profligate, and helpless half) of Europe. Believe me, I can sympathize with you, I have been through it; I have longed for Rome, and boldly faced the consequences of joining Rome; and though I now have, thank God, cast all wish to change behind me years ago, as a great, lying, devil's temptation, yet I still long as ardently as ever to see in the Church of England much which now exists only, alas, in the Church of Rome.

However much of the Catholic Church Kingsley may have honestly admired, what he loathed, detested, and abominated is that which Catholics believe to be the very mark of the Church's holiness, her espousal of the evangelical counsel of chastity. Although in many of the love scenes of Kingsley's novels, the physical plays perhaps too prominent a part, yet withal, Kingsley's concept of the relation between the sexes was wholesome enough. But in his treatment of celibacy this enemy of Catholicism goes into an almost insensate fury.

If these were all of Kingsley's prejudices, one might excuse him as being the victim of 300 years of historical falsehood. One might even grant Hugh Kingsmill that Newman was too harsh on the man who merely voiced the prejudices of every honest Englishman in holding in fear and aversion the Papal system. But Kingsley's bigotry was deeper. His lack of charity cannot be lightly dismissed on the grounds of education and environment. In a deliberate, inexcusable, and shameful manner he went out of his way in that charming and innocent story, "The Water Babies," to poison the minds of children, not only against the Catholic Faith, but against the honesty and integrity of the Irish character.

An exclamation of pained surprise coming from my eager-eyed eight-year-old nephew called forcibly to my attention a most offensive passage in this lovely children's story. Tom, the chimney sweep, who has been turned into a water baby, interrogates his play-mate, Dennis, who has just been caught in a harmless fib:

And then Dennis will look up at you with his handsome, sly, soft, sleepy, good-natured, untrustable Irish grey eye, and answer with the prettiest smile, "Shure, and didn't I think your Honour would like a pleasant answer?" So you must not trust Dennis because he is in the habit of giving pleasant answers; but instead of being angry with him you must remember he is a poor Paddy and knows no better, so you must burst out laughing; and then he will burst out laughing too, and slave for you and show you good sport, if he can, for he is an affectionate fellow and as fond of sports as you are—and if he can't, he will tell you fibs instead, a hundred an hour; and wonder all the while why poor old Ireland does not prosper like England and Scotland, and some other places where folk have taken up the ridiculous fancy that honesty is the best policy . . . and then if you have sense, you will turn and talk to the great giant of a gilly who lies basking on the stone beside you. He will tell you no fibs, my little man; for he is a Scotchman, and fears God, and not the priest; and as you talk with him, you will be surprised more and more at his knowledge, his sense, his humour, and his courtesy.

One who would write in that uncharitable and slanderous vein is fated to destruction, for his very conceit and violence and rashness will egg him on to challenge the gods to combat. And so it happened. Father Ignatius

Dudley Ryder wrote at the time of the Newman-Kingsley controversy—

It is impossible, I think, whatever may be one's sympathies, to avoid a sense of honest pity for the victim as for one condemned, though by his own rashness, to fight with gods or with the elements. It is not merely with him as with one hurled from his chariot in an Homeric onset with the gaping wound inflicted by a single spear, but his form is crushed and dislocated; and a hostile stream—Simois or peradventure, Scamander—hurries him away rejoicing in its strength with the rush of many waters, yet not so far away but for long, and still beneath the sun of noon or the moon of night, beneath tempestuous gleams or the keen serenity of the stars we get glimpses of the helpless burden as it is tossed hither and thither in the eddying stream until the darkness swallows it.

Truly it was written whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

REVIEWS

Vincent Van Gogh. By JULIUS MEIER-GRAEFE. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$3.00.

In an age of biography another biography appears, this time a translation from the German, of one whom the artistic world has long known and long admired: Vincent Van Gogh, artist and painter, born in the Low Countries in 1853; died in France in 1890. This is the story of a spirit, delicate and refined, and of a spiritual character that lifts the story above ordinary levels. Students of the human soul have always been intrigued by the deep, the delicate, the refined, and the spiritual in human psychology. Sometimes such qualities have gone wildly astray as in the story of D. H. Lawrence or Maurice de Guerin. Sometimes they have been elevated by the Divine into visions of absolute beauty, as is mirrored in the soul of Maurice de Guerin's own sister, as is seen in the life of Madam de la Ferronnays, in "Consummata," and in the far better known career of a canonized saint, the "Little Flower." Women have seemed more often in these matters of the spirit to have been able to touch what is out of reach and to seize what is beyond the grasp of most. And yet not always, especially where supernatural grace enters in, for we have Paul Claudel and Jacques Rivière, who are but a prominent pair in a galaxy. Vincent Van Gogh is of the galaxy. Delicate, refined, gifted, and spiritual, with perhaps a richer supernatural light in his soul than the biographer has been able to portray. P. M. D.

Roosevelt and His America. By BERNARD FAÏ. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. \$2.75.

The author of this book is a Frenchman who spends several months every year in the United States, has taught at some of our universities, and is manifestly acquainted with our political life. Thus, while primarily writing for Frenchmen, he is no casual observer, with a European bias, but speaks with authoritative knowledge. He tries and succeeds in giving an accurate picture. For that reason he had to speak openly. The book is divided into three parts. The first is a brief history of the political "inventors" of America: Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Wilson; the second he entitles "America lost" by its "wreckers," Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, dubbed "three wooden kings"; the third is a study of the America of Franklin Roosevelt, or "America finds itself again." In a simple, unadorned yet fascinating narrative, FaÏ paints his characters in their historic setting and background. Roosevelt, in the author's analysis, is an innovator, yet not a radical. The very name is sacred in American political history. It stands for ability and honesty. Franklin Delano is drawn true to nature: an honest, fearless, independent youth of ambition and strong, winning personality. Later, he becomes a American patrician deeply interested in the mass of plebeians. Republican campaign slander and chicanery

against Alfred E. Smith and other Presidential contenders are shown in their hideousness and are seen recoiling upon the heads of the party leaders. The greatest achievement of President Roosevelt, according to Fay, and the greatest in the last thirty years of our history, is that he has been willing and able to rule; that is, that he has shouldered the responsibilities of guiding the people and getting them to understand, approve, and obey every decision without attempting to bully or blind them. P. H. B.

Reminiscences of an American Scholar. By JOHN W. BURGESS. New York: Columbia University Press. \$3.50.

Dr. Burgess, the sometime professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law in Columbia University, recounts in this volume the story of his life from the ante-bellum days in Tennessee, down through his student days first at Cumberland University, then at Amherst, Knox, and finally his student years in Germany, his years of teaching at Amherst and Columbia up to his appointment as exchange professor at Berlin. It is an amiable narrative, giving one glimpses of an academic America that is gone forever. It is distressing that the reminiscences of this really fine scholar stopped so soon (1907); the concluding chapter, on the later years, contributed by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, cannot but be unsatisfactory. Burgess was one of the many American scholars to whom the ideal of *Wissenschaft* learned at the German universities never lost its glamor. The Great War and the passions it aroused must have been a sore trial to this true friend of Germany. Perhaps it would have been impossible for him to have described the later years when Teutonic scholarship and Teutonic ideals were discounted. The sub-title, "The Beginnings of Columbia University," suggested possibly by President Butler, is not altogether unmerited. When Burgess went there it was Columbia College and he describes interestingly the machinery that was set in motion to transform it into the Columbia University of today. For this reason alone, the book is worth perusal by the historian of education, as well as for the appendix which contains the admirable, though dated, essay that first appeared in 1884, on "The American University: When shall it be? Where shall it be? What shall it be?" W. J. M.

The Great Tradition. By GRANVILLE HICKS. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

This latest guide book through the confusing forest of modern American literature is an excellent example of the strength and weakness of an over-unified synthesis. The author's wide knowledge of the historical facts, his sympathetic appreciation of literary art, and his power of brilliant summary and felicitous phrasing combine to produce a most readable interpretation of an important theme. Unfortunately the principle of unity which carries the narrative along, and which is signified by the somewhat mysterious title, is the persistent and steady growth of the proletarian revolution. Literature is to be judged primarily by its contribution to the reform of the social order. The principle seems axiomatic to Mr. Hicks, and by it he classes with devastating results the best known American writers from Emerson down to the present. Accordingly, poets and novelists who choose to write on historical or romantic themes are dismissed as "fugitives"; of this group are Emily Dickinson and Henry James of the recent past, T. S. Eliot and Willa Cather at the present time. Even writers who, like Dreiser and Sherwood Anderson, protest their Communism do not escape the careful scrutiny of their Marxian critic; they are blamed for the confusion of their social ideas, and suspected of materialistic aims. Among the very few who survive the difficult test and win unqualified praise, John Dos Passos leads all the rest. Such is the big reward of "realizing in the emotions and translating into action" the trend toward revolution. Readers who prefer their literary history without a Marxian preachment will not be favorably impressed by the confusions of this book; even the others may feel that Mr. Hicks has over-shot the mark and wasted his critical talents. A. C. S.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Looking at Governments.—As the New Deal progresses, the revolutionary character and the unity as a single historic episode of the events that have occurred since the beginning of the Roosevelt Administration have become clearer. In "The Third American Revolution" (New York: Association Press. \$1.75) Benson Y. Landis summarizes these events in the form of a highly readable and convenient handbook. Dr. Landis, as research secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, has a well-established reputation as an interpreter of current history, particularly American social and religious movements. He is gifted in summarizing complex facts in popular, yet accurate and objective fashion. He is appreciative of the interest that Catholics feel in the ethical features of the recent governmental developments; while he is impartial politically. An appendix: "How to use this book for discussion," renders Dr. Landis' little work practical for discussion groups and study clubs.

A brief "analysis of the principal effects of the Russian experiment, a record of achievements and failures within the Union, and a survey of the Soviet relations with other countries," is provided by the research expert of the Foreign Policy Association, Vera Micheles Dean, in her "Soviet Russia: 1917-1933" (Boston: World Peace Foundation. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 25 cents). Miss Dean's little book provides a convenient summary for students. One may question her limiting the total of disfranchised persons to 8,000,000 (page 19); and of the exiles to North Russia and Siberia to "engineers convicted of sabotage, embezzlers of State property, and ordinary criminals." Much larger classes than these have suffered exile.

The compilers of the report, "The United States and the Soviet Union," of the Committee on Russian-American Relations of the American Foundation (New York: 565 Fifth Avenue. Paper, \$1.00) complain, in their foreword, that "the report has not been in all respects easy to acquire and that, to an unusual degree, prejudice has enjoyed an open opportunity." The report, as was to be expected, presents a highly useful collection of statistics and facts, particularly with regard to trade. But its further study does not rid one of the impression that for its authors anything that looked like a questioning of the eagerly desired goal of recognition was just a "prejudice," and nothing more. Arguments against recognition are presented, at the outset, with a gesture of impatience, as "the familiar arguments against recognition," as against the "arguments commonly advanced for recognition." The "religious issue" is likewise dismissed in a summary and entirely misleading two-and-a-half pages.

Cheering Essays.—Whatever was said about Vera Tracy's last book, "Burnished Chalice," might be repeated about her latest, "Blue Portfolio" (Bruce. \$1.50). Here is a second series of genuine familiar essays, woven out of the fantasies, dreams, joys, heartaches of home, school, and hospital life. Here is a writer who sits up in her bed of pain and argues and pleads and chides and teases and cajoles and even shames her readers into joyous acceptance of life's burdens. You will be delighted with "Sunny," this gay little invalid, whether she is praying in her sick-room, or chatting with a neighbor from her wheel chariot, or seated on her throne in the hospital garden, giving audience to the West Wind. That her sallies are deeply spiritual and often highly amusing is nothing against them. It is rather an invitation to all essay lovers to gather around and enjoy them and wonder with this reader at that marvelous mirror on her sun-porch which reflects the whole world.

It was a delightful wind that bore these fourteen papers, "Borne on the Wind" (Browne and Nolan. 5/.), by Alice Curtayne, to our shores. Light, crisp, brief—sometimes all too brief—they are alive with a fresh spirituality that should win them favor from all who like their reading not too light. They cover a wide variety of topics, from the delightful sketch on the "Silence of Matt Talbot" to "Italy's Battle for the Wheat." They are valuable

not only for their own charm, but for the curiosity they may arouse to learn more of the subjects that are here so briefly, but so deftly presented.

"On Running after One's Hat" (McBride. \$1.00) is a collection of twenty humorous essays by G. K. Chesterton, selected by E. V. Knox, editor of *Punch*, who for a lifetime has been passing expert judgment on humor. The selection has been very well made, including some that have been on the lips of critics for years, e.g., "On Running after One's Hat" and "The Mistake of the Machine," in which Chesterton returns to his old fight against those who believe in substituting machinery and statistics in place of men and imagination. No one can go wrong in reading these essays again. No one, Mr. Knox least of all, would consider this little book the final word regarding the best humor of Chesterton. Chesterton is so rich in this quality and has such an uncanny gift of making it the servant of the highest philosophical teaching that there cannot be any last word.

Book collectors are a race of beings set apart. They assume a delightful authority from their possession of literary treasures to discourse when, where, and of what they will, and generally it makes agreeable, if not always profound, reading. An egregious veteran among them, A. Edward Newton, calls his current collection of essays "End Papers" (Little, Brown. \$3.00), and in them he unbridles his enthusiasms for Anthony Trollope, Laurence Sterne, Agnes Repplier, Oliver Goldsmith, Charles Dickens, and many another pet. It has the fault of all such books: it makes you want to talk back, and doesn't let you. Or is that a fault?

Those who know William Lyon Phelps, whether through contact with him in the classroom, or from his published volumes, will be happy to find that this genial litterateur has given us a concrete expression of his exquisite taste. "What I Like" (Scribner's. \$2.75) is a collection of prose excerpts of various lengths and subjects, passages from authors that represent the preferences of one who has spent long and happy hours in reading, and happier hours, one might suspect, in remembering. A mere glance at the table of contents is sufficient indication that the range of this reading is wide, and that the authors whose works are cited are, for the most part, those whom we cherish. True, one might take issue with Mr. Phelps over the inclusion of Victor Hugo or Schopenhauer, and yet admire his choice of passages even from the works of these men. A wholesome literary sense has aided in making "What I Like" a genuine treasure house.

Books Received.—This list is published without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

ANTONIO. Ernest Oldmeadow. Peter Reilly. \$1.00. University of Chicago Press.
ART IN AMERICA FROM 1600 TO 1865. \$1.00. University of Chicago Press.
BACON. Charles Williams. \$3.50. Harper.
BECOMING A WRITER. Dorothea Brande. \$2.00. Harcourt, Brace.
BLESSED GEMMA GALGANI. Father Germania. \$2.75. Herder.
CITY HARVEST. Margaret C. Dawson. \$2.00. Macmillan.
CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY. Albert Muntz, S.J. \$3.75. Bruce.
DARE TO LIVE. Gerald Breitling. \$2.00. Falcon Press.
FAMILY AFFAIR. Nella G. White. \$2.00. Stokes.
FAREWELL VICTORIA. T. H. White. \$2.00. Smith and Haas.
GALLOWS OF CHANCE. The. E. Phillips Oppenheim. \$2.00. Little, Brown.
GARDENER'S HANDBOOK. L. H. Bailey. \$3.00. Macmillan.
GATES OF HELL. The. Erik R. v. Kuhnelt-Leddihn. \$2.50. Sheed and Ward.
GUIDE TO PLAY SELECTION. Milton Smith. \$1.25. Appleton-Century.
GUILDS OF AMERICA. The. Henry Creange. \$3.75. Guilds of America Foundation.
HOSPITAL MURDERS. The. Means Davis. \$2.00. Smith and Haas.
HOW TO SUCCEED IN LIFE. Grenville Kleiser. \$2.00. Funk and Wagnalls.
IN SIGHT OF EDEN. Roger Vercel. \$2.50. Harcourt, Brace.
INEVITABLE CROSS. The. W. E. Orchard. \$2.00. Dutton.
LIFE OF CARDINAL MERCIER. The. John A. Gade. \$2.75. Scribner's.
MARIA MAZZARELLO. Rev. Henry L. Hughes. \$1.25. Herder.
MOSCOW, 1911-1933. Allan Monkhouse. \$3.50. Little, Brown.
OUR PRIMITIVE CONTEMPORARIES. George P. Murdock. \$5.00. Macmillan.
PAGE MR. POMEROY. Elizabeth Jordan. \$2.00. Appleton-Century.
POINTS IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY VERSE. Iolo A. Williams. \$5.00. Bowker.
PSYCHOLOGY OF ADOLESCENCE. The. Karl C. Garrison. \$3.00. Prentice-Hall.
RECENT POLITICAL THOUGHT. Francis W. Coker. \$4.00. Appleton-Century.
RICHES FOR CAROLINE. Edwin Bateman Morris. \$2.00. Penn.
ST. FRANCIS DE SALES IN HIS LETTERS. \$2.50. Herder.
SERVANT OF THE SACRED HEART. The. Edited by George O'Neill, S.J. \$1.25. Herder.
SUCH IS MY BELOVED. Morley Callaghan. \$2.00. Scribner's.
THIRD SON. The. Margaret Cuklin Banning. \$2.00. Harper.
THROUGH MEXICO ON HORSEBACK. J. C. Goodwin. \$2.00. South-West Press.
WE RIDE THE GALE! Emilie Loring. \$2.00. Penn.

Life Returns to Die. Jonathan's Daughter. The Death of a World. There Are Victories.

Arnold Paige, comes to a small Berkshire town, falls in love with Barbara Allen, while unconsciously causing another girl to love him. The latter, Anne Farrel, helps Arnold to win his love, then goes away to War-time Paris to forget. Arnold enlists with the Canadian forces, is severely wounded, and nursed back to life by Anne. Though she knows that he sees in her only his former love, she consents to his plea that they marry. Arnold lives only long enough to bring Anne to home and safety, then dies upon the grave of his first love. In outline "Life Returns To Die" (Benziger. \$2.00), by Edward A. Herron, is a melancholy tale. Suffusing every page of the book, however, is an inward radiance of faith, so that the melancholy is vested with a sort of unaffected nobility. Told with clarity, economy of language and detail, and an assurance amazing in so young a writer (the book is Mr. Herron's first), "Life Returns To Die" deserves to be recommended as an intelligent example of Catholic fiction of the newer and better sort.

"Jonathan's Daughter" (Macrae-Smith. \$2.00), by Lida Larimore, is a sympathetic story of the conflict between love and duty. The decision Ann Lowell must make involves either marrying Sandy MacArdle, the man she loves, or else, sacrificing romance, continuing her life as secretary to her father, Jonathan, a journalist who has written a tremendously successful first novel and who, it seems, needs Ann's constant devotion to encourage and inspire him. The story of Ann's decision is unfolded with charm and wholesome emotion, but not, however, without an occasional resort to a tedious, saccharine sentimentality.

In "The Death of a World" (Holt. \$2.50), Romain Rolland continues his long novel dealing with post-War life in France. The heroine of earlier sections of the novel, Henriette, appears in the pages of the latest, somewhat older, of course, but still the amoral, efficient, advanced New Woman. Towards the end of the story she seems to interest the author less than does a new character, a younger, and, perhaps, a Newer Woman. Rolland, by means of his invective, his eloquence, his wit, his irony, his brilliantly etched and intensely lighted scenes convinces the reader that many of the results of the World War were reprehensible. But his remedies for the defects of bourgeoisdom, subtly suggested and never preached outright, are of a peculiarly romantic and feeble character. Amoralism, quietism, Socialism, pacificism, and the whole bag of anti-intellectualist tricks are known to be his favorite prescriptions for modern ills. Many of them are given due and artistic consideration in the latest product of his vivid and febrile imagination. "The Death of a World" is indeed a brilliantly written novel, passionate and tender, ugly and beautiful, convincing and ambiguous, all of these by turns, a typical product of one of the strangest of the distinguished figures of the twentieth century.

Sexual filth is liberally smeared over the pages of "There Are Victories" (Covici, Friede. \$2.25), by Charles Yale Harrison. To picture the married life of the heroine as intolerable the author depicts her husband as a perfect brute, given to sexual excess from his youth and pushed down to the lowest depths by his experiences in the World War. Rebellion against the Catholic teaching on the indissolubility of matrimony starts the wife on a restless quest for happiness as she conceives it. Despairing, she turns to the cowardly solution of suicide. If one could abstract from the foul details of the book, it might be called an illustration of the Apostle's warning that the wages of sin is death. As soon as she is faced by a real crisis, the woman begins to cast off her Catholic principles; under the influence of her lover she half believes she is a genuine agnostic. Being unable at the end to accept his dogma of sexual promiscuity and finding that age has worn thin her physical attractiveness, she fatuously concludes that life is no longer worth living and, like many a modern, she leaves life without knowing why she came into it. It is a drab picture of moral failure, with nothing to recommend it.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Lillian Gish's Convent Days

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In a recent issue of your review a writer, commenting on Philip Barry's play "The Joyous Season," asks the question: "How and where did Lillian Gish learn to put herself in a nun's habit and for the time become the essence of all the most inspired Sisters a convent graduate has known and loved?"

It may be of interest to know that Miss Gish is proud to say she was a pupil of the St. Louis Ursulines, and her Ursuline teachers are proud of her.

Arcadia, Mo.

AN URSULINE NUN.

Frustrating International Peace

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I trespass on your columns to call the attention of readers of AMERICA to the article in the March issue of *Fortune* entitled "Arms and the Men"? It confirms with a mass of detailed information my own article "Disarm the Munitions Makers!" published in AMERICA last June 3. All Catholics, above all Catholic teachers and journalists, should realize the supreme importance of this question. A great vested interest is deeply interested in frustrating international peace. Its very life blood is competitive armament and war. AMERICA and the *Month* have more than once exposed the malign influence of the private traffic in munitions. Despite present conditions it is not the time to haul down the flag. The solution of our present problems should not be left to the cannon merchant and the undertaker. Now is the acceptable time to fight for peace. If men really realized just why they are being mobilized for the next war, it might be averted. I think that the rising generation is loath to sacrifice life and limb for Manchurian oil, the Open Door, or such adages which in the concrete mean dividends for the munitions maker and the undertaker!

New York.

LAURENCE K. PATTERSON, S.J.

An Elder Answers

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Personally I squirmed under the lash of John Bayer's accusations in his article "A Young Man Speaks" [AMERICA, February 14]. Truth sometimes makes one do that. But because the article is so true and intense it needs further examination to eliminate the air of hopelessness about it.

John has, in the parlance of his day and age, passed the buck. He has taken the bad example of others as an excuse for weakness in his own kind. He forgets that every normal human reaches the age of reason about the seventh year and thereafter has the privilege of free will. If a man were to dig a hole in John's path, he would not fall in; he would find another way round. Nor would he commit murder just because they were killing someone across the street. He selects his own course of action.

There is filthy literature, but John's own hands pick it up if it is read. He is not forced into the book-store library. There is a free, circulating library nearby, wherein the wealth of the world's finest minds is dusty for want of his touch! Nor is he pulled into the obscene movie. He first signifies to himself his desire to go in. There is always a better picture further down the street. Patronage, as well as adult indifference, leads to an increase in off-color pictures; and one can see the under twenty-ones *en masse* at any movie show. It was my task, recently, to stand in a lobby and check up attendance at a filthy picture from which a

club of Catholic mothers had pledged themselves to keep their children. In less than an hour I counted eighteen adolescents whom I knew had been admonished against going. Could John call this the indifference of over thirty? To me it was a terrible spectacle of the defiance of under twenty-one.

Are John's friends really clamoring for adult guidance? All the parents I know are relegated to the realm of the old-fashioned if they dare oppose this new freedom of youth. We are told we do not understand. Oh, too many of us deserve John's censure! He writes truly. But this is our meed of damnation. Youth must come through in spite of our sins—not hide behind them! Every year hundreds of under twenty-ones leave the world for seminaries and cloisters. They have the same hot blood surging, the same curiosities, the same capacity to love all of life that John has. But they do not choose to let these things rule them. No bad example detains them. They recognize free will.

This is the era of youth. If youth is lost, the world is lost. But youth must discount environment and seek its assistance from within. There are still many of us giving all of our lives to help, but we can only point out pitfalls; we cannot carry them over. We can't be in so many places at one time!

And how about the help of the ever-guiding Father, the never-failing Mother—the Church? Why not depend more on her admonitions as an incentive to finer action? She never is a traitor to his youth!

Flushing, N. Y.

M. V. D.

The Evidence Conference

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The man who got tired of being in jail and simply got up and walked out is a symbol of our American Catholics today—at least of what they would like to do and what in some places they are doing fairly effectively. We need not mention that the imprisonment has been an unjust one and that our jail has been the ignorance and even the hostility of so many of our fellow-Americans regarding the Catholic Church and things Catholic. How much of it has been deliberate is not of great importance. But what does matter is that we should walk out the front door and explain to our countrymen the truth and the facts about our religion.

To speak seriously, of course, this has been the attempt of our Catholic clergy and people from the beginning. Other problems, however, have claimed their attention, matters dealing with Catholic life itself. At the present time many means are being used to spread information in regard to the Faith. Books and periodicals, radio programs and some lectures, as well as other mediums, are all helping to bring the facts and their explanation directly to those outside the Church. But the most direct method, of literally going out and telling people about the Catholic Church, is only beginning to become known in this country.

I refer, of course, to the Catholic Evidence Movement, which saw a beginning with David Goldstein and the Catholic Truth Society in Boston, but more widely and more fully organized in the Catholic Evidence Guilds in England. Both streams have met in the Catholic Evidence Conference in this country, which holds its meetings annually and represents the Guilds and their work in a number of cities and districts of the United States. It is essentially a work for Catholic laymen and women, a system of training in apologetics and of preaching and explaining the Faith in public with the approval and sanction of the Bishops.

Perhaps for the first time a full, satisfactory article on this work and its present status in the United States has appeared. In a very excellent discussion and appeal in *Columbia* for February John H. Reddin writes to his fellow Knights of Columbus on "Catholic Evidence Guilds." The summary is too good to be allowed to pass unnoticed. For any Catholic man or woman to whom this form of Catholic apostolate has an attraction the information set forth in this article will prove both enlightening and inspiring.

Weston, Mass.

HUGH H. BLAKE, S.J.

Chronicle

Home News.—Senator Wagner on March 1 introduced in the Senate a bill for a permanent national labor board, which would have power to settle labor disputes. The bill would abolish company unions, fortify and clarify Section 7a of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and assure to both labor and capital means of settling disputes. By an executive order on March 3, the President removed from the National Compliance Board of the NRA the power to review the Labor Board's findings, thus opening the way for that Board to obtain prompt enforcement of its decisions. The Board immediately called on four companies to show cause why their cases should not be cited to the Department of Justice for quick action. The NRA Code Authority conference met in Washington on March 5. On the previous day, the Consumers Advisory Board advised General Johnson that some industries had a tendency to "forget the recovery program in their own interests." The Board asked that certain code provisions be carefully re-examined to remedy this. President Roosevelt spoke at the first day of the Conference. He told the gathering that the recovery program was here to stay; that the NRA had given industry a protected form of self-government; and that industry should endeavor to employ more workers and give wage increases so as to expand further purchasing power. General Johnson asked for a ten-per-cent cut in hours of labor and a corresponding increase in pay for industries under NRA, which the representatives of industry rejected. They declared such action would cause price increases that the consumers would resist. General Johnson again asked for this reduction of hours and increase of wages on March 7, when he also warned that he was preparing to enforce the penal sections of the Recovery Act against non-compliance. In a letter to Senator McKellar, the President on March 7 proposed that the air mail be returned to private carriers as soon as possible, but under conditions which would avoid past evils which had led to the recent cancelation of all domestic contracts. Government payments to all air-mail companies whose contracts were canceled had been held up since January. The Department of Justice was understood to be studying the testimony to see whether there was a basis for prosecution in connection with charges of fraud and collusion. The President sent several messages to Congress during the early part of March. On March 1, he asked authorization of \$2,000,000,000 in bonds to be exchanged for home mortgages as direct Government obligations. On March 2, he recommended the abandonment of all military bases in the Philippine Islands; he also asked for a grant of authority to enable him to establish a new tariff policy which would stimulate foreign trade by reciprocal agreements. The Senate passed the Naval Replacement Bill on March 6. The Supreme Court, on March 5, five to four, upheld New York State's right to fix milk prices.

Naval Race?—Signals seemed to be set for an international building race in the naval field. Four new cruisers were included in the estimate sent by the British Admiralty to Parliament on March 7. The estimate was £56,550,000, which was the largest naval appropriation in Great Britain since 1928. Work would be begun in 1934, for completion before the end of 1936 would be contrary to the London naval treaty with the United States—of one 5,200-ton cruiser, and three new Mino-taur type of 9,000 tons. Sir Bolton M. Eyres Monsell, First Lord of the Admiralty, frankly told Parliament last November that Great Britain practically had to build larger cruisers because Japan and the United States were doing so. The French naval program calling for expenditures of 913,000,000 francs and the construction of four vessels, one of them a 26,000-ton man-of-war, was approved on March 6 by the Chamber of Deputies naval committee. A giant bombing seaplane, of extraordinary range and effectiveness, would be added to the air force. A naval race between France and Italy was hinted at on March 6 in the Italian newspaper, *Giornale d'Italia*.

Versailles Relaxing?—An utterance on March 7 by the Count de Broqueville, Belgian Foreign Minister, during a discussion of the Foreign Affairs budget in the Belgian Parliament, was interpreted in Berlin as a loosening of the rigidity of the Treaty of Versailles. The Minister believed that either of the two currently proposed alternatives in the case of Germany's rearming were impossible: a "preventive war" or the invocation of the restrictions laid down by Article 213 of the Versailles Treaty. Hence, he concluded, friendly arms agreements should be negotiated. The utterance met with considerable dissatisfaction in France. At the same time, German foreign relations were improved by the signing on March 7 of a commercial agreement with Poland, by which a nine-year trade war would be ended, and many obstructive trade prohibitions, tariffs, embargoes and quotas, etc. would be removed. Trade balances would be gradually adjusted.

American Peace Plan.—A universal treaty of non-aggression was proposed in the reply given on February 19 by the United States Government to the British disarmament memorandum of January 29. The reply was made public in Washington on March 2. This plan had been first advanced by President Roosevelt in his message to fifty-four nations of the world on May 16, 1933. The British memorandum contained modifications of the MacDonald peace program; and called for drastic reduction of armaments, though assigning a longer period during which the reduction would take place. The United States held the view that the most logical way in which to limit and reduce armaments was to limit and reduce the use to which armaments could be put. A universal undertaking, in the American plan, would be given that the armed forces of no State should invade the territory of another country in violation of treaty rights. Weapons of primary use in invasion would be abolished, such as

heavy tanks, etc.; and there would be continuous and automatic inspection.

Third Lerroux Cabinet.—Alejandro Lerroux accepted the President's invitation early last week to form another Cabinet, and on March 3 its personnel was announced. The new Cabinet proved to be practically the same as the one that had fallen during the previous week, although it included three new Ministers—Salvador de Madariaga, the former Ambassador to the United States, for Public Instruction, Señor Marraco for Finance, and Señor Cid, of the Agrarian party, for Communications. Thus it comprised another minority Government and was not favorably regarded by the Catholic Popular Actionists. On March 6, the new Government appeared before the Cortes, and because the Socialists were unable to bring up an issue upon which a vote of confidence could be debated, it survived their attack. Gil Robles, however, predicted that it would not last until April, since its personnel had caused great disappointment throughout the country. On March 7 a state of alarm, which under the law is merely a step away from martial law, was declared. Labor troubles in Madrid, Barcelona, and Santander brought this about. The building-trades workers of Madrid struck when a small proportion of the Employers Association refused to live up to the forty-four-hour week agreement recently brought about with Government help. Meanwhile the Socialist Deputy Largo Caballero continued his extremist statements. "The working class," he said last week, "must prepare itself to take political and economic power by violence because the political situation will be solved ultimately either by a Rightist dictatorship or a workers' dictatorship."

Germany's Position Stronger.—The watchful-waiting attitude of Chancellor Hitler permitted circumstances to favor his program. Belgium's admission, through Premier de Broqueville, of the unwillingness of the great Powers to curb rearmament in Germany by violence seemed to indicate that Germany was going ahead with its military program unchecked. A kindlier attitude towards Austria was reported, and the quiescent state of the Austrian Nazis was considered the result. The Nazi leader in the Saar, Alois Spaniol, was recalled and the coercive policy hitherto employed was greatly modified by the Commissioner of the Saar, Von Papen. On March 3 a favorable economic agreement with Denmark was signed at Copenhagen. Hitler, through Hans Adolf von Moltke, signed a protocol with Foreign Minister Joseph Beck of Poland, removing the pile of restrictions and prohibitions accumulated in a tariff war. Propaganda Minister Goebbels denied rumors that Germany would return to the League of Nations. The Government claimed continued reductions of unemployment and success in its drive for relief funds. A plan to provide 2,000,000 more jobs after March 31 was set on foot. A great welfare drive uniting the whole nation in a move to provide relief of all mothers and their children, with "romantic realism" as its slogan, was launched with enthusiasm. It was officially reported that

the total number of political prisoners was 8,000 on March 5. The High Court of Karlsruhe ruled on the validity of the law permitting annulment of marriages between Aryans and Jews.

Furore in France.—The investigations into the Stavisky scandal and the recent street riots kept the nation agog with sensational revelations. It was proved that Magistrate Prince had been drugged before his murder. Deputy Prosecutor Henri Hurlaux was removed from office and attempted suicide when an incriminating letter he had written to Stavisky was discovered. Stavisky letters involving Albert Dalimier and Henri Queuille were published. Stavisky's check book, object of a long search by investigators, was recovered. Jean Chiappe, former prefect of Paris police, testified that Eugène Frot, Daladier's Minister of Interior, had built up a secret force of men and had plotted to seize power and institute a dictatorship of the Left. Further startling revelations were promised for the coming week.

Japanese Foreign Trade.—A bill investing the Tokyo Cabinet with extensive powers over foreign trade was submitted during the week to the Diet. The bill provided for control both of exports and imports, its aim being to maintain a fair balance of trade without any interference from Parliament. Its duration was limited to five years.

Austria Rallying to Dollfuss.—The position of Chancellor Dollfuss and his regime seemed more secure, with prospects of a peaceful solution of Austria's domestic difficulties. The Heimwehr after their complete victory over the Socialists devoted their energy to demonstrations of their military ability to protect the present Government. Rumors that Prince Von Starhemberg meant to use his power to set himself up as a dictator were denied, and the facts confirmed his protestations of loyalty to Dollfuss. The Chancellor on March 4 addressed 20,000 people at Villach, Carinthia, giving an outline of the new Constitution. He affirmed that Austria would be neither Fascist nor Nazi, but an independent Constitution built on Christian principles with Christian love uniting all elements and the nation, and particularly guaranteeing happy living conditions to the working and peasant classes. He frankly confessed that the Constitution would be based on the Pope's Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno." On March 2 the Government issued a decree dissolving all trade unions. The leader of the Christian Social party trade unions, Deputy Leopold Kunschak, seemed reluctant to place his men under the Heimwehr leaders. On March 6, a decree established one central organization under the Minister of Social Welfare, Odo Neustaedter-Stürmer, who is a Heimwehr Leader.

Meeting in Rome.—It was definitely announced on March 3 in Rome that Chancellor Dollfuss of Austria and Premier Goemboes of Hungary would arrive in Rome for a special visit and series of conference with Premier Mus-

solini March 14 to 16. The conversations would deal principally with economic affairs. It was thought that the economic situation of the Danubian countries would be foremost, as well as further expansion of trade. No indication was given as to whether any political matters might come up; and rumors as to the discussion of the restoration of the Hapsburg monarchy were vigorously denied.

Arctic Disaster.—Elaborate preparations were being made in Moscow for the rescue of 101 men, women, and children marooned on ice floes near the Bering Straits, as a consequence of the sinking of the Soviet vessel Chelyuskin on February 13. Two fliers were able to reach their camp on March 5. Three Soviet fliers arriving in New York planned to take part in the rescue expedition. The region was described as a "death trap" by Alaskan veterans, and grave fears expressed for the victims. The Chelyuskin's trip had been intended to demonstrate the feasibility of an unimpeded northerly passage.

Chaco Proposal.—The League of Nations Chaco commission made public on March 4 its new plan of peace for Bolivia and Paraguay, by a treaty which would free the whole Chaco region from armies until the World Court would have had a chance to pass upon the issues. Each armed force would retire, the Paraguayans 250 miles to the Paraguay River, the Bolivians to a point 125 to 175 miles behind present lines. The area would be then patrolled, chiefly by Paraguayan police. The document described the situation as a "state of war," and raised a dilemma concerning the application of sanctions under Article XVI of the League Covenant, which would require severance of relations by the other members of the League. Both sides, Bolivia and Paraguay, were reported as rejecting the plan, and the former Government submitted an alternative program.

Ireland's President.—Speaking before the Dail on March 1, Mr. de Valera, in the course of the debate on his bill to ban the Blue Shirts, declared that if the Opposition and his own party would join hands a compromise might be reached to preserve order in the Free State with a composite national force. Admitting that the Government was in a serious and difficult position because of the recent riots that attended political meetings, the President addressed both sides of the House before a crowded chamber. "I hate coercion," said the President. "We introduced the Public Safety Act to prevent bloodshed in the streets of Dublin. We introduced the present bill with reluctance." On March 2 the bill passed its second reading by a vote of 80 to 60. The real test will come in the Senate where the Opposition was reported to have sufficient votes to prevent the measure from becoming law until 1935. The prospect of a general election in the near future with its danger of serious clashes was said to have influenced Mr. de Valera in making his suggestion for a composite army. The Opposition, however, refused to comment on Mr. de Valera's proposal.

Cuba Curbs Communists.—President Mendieta signed several decrees on March 7 suspending Constitutional guarantees throughout Cuba for ninety days. The purpose of the decrees was to wipe out Communism, which was spreading rapidly throughout the Island, and to prevent disturbances by native and foreign agitators. An unsuccessful attempt was made to assassinate Secretary of State de la Torriente by occupants of a car armed with a machine gun. Thousands of sugar workers, cigar makers, and railroad workers were on strike. Military authorities arrested over a hundred Communistic agitators. A group of 400 students stormed the Department of Public Instruction building to protest against the cancellation of all grades given since 1929. On March 5, Dr. Octavio Zubizarreta, General Machado's Secretary of the Interior, and three members of Machado's secret police were sentenced to die for acts of violence committed when they were in power. They had been found guilty of the murder of Dr. Miguel Aguiar, member of the House of Representatives, and the three de Andrade brothers who were political enemies of General Machado.

Chinese Denounce Manchukuo.—Much indignation was aroused throughout China last week by the coronation of Henry Pu Yi as Emperor of Manchukuo. "High treason against the Chinese Republic," said Premier Wang Ching-wei in an official statement of the attitude of Nanking towards the enthronement. He asserted that the Emperor and the other members of the Manchukuo Government were "members of a theatrical troupe," under Japanese direction while changes of titles were mere "shifts in a puppet play." In the press of North China brief accounts of the coronation were given, but the language was drenched with sarcasm and contempt. In Canton thousands of men, women, and children joined in a demonstration against Manchukuo. The paraders appealed to the public to start a boycott against Japanese goods.

Next week's issue of AMERICA will be especially devoted to celebrating the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of Maryland.

As a notable feature we have asked the Governor of Maryland, the Hon. Albert C. Ritchie, to set forth the principles of civic and religious of which the Maryland Colony was so admirable an example. His very interesting paper will be called "Maryland, the Home of Religious and Civic Liberty."

Another feature will be a study by John LaFarge of the spiritual and religious aspects of the Colony, and of the place held therein by the Jesuits in particular. His paper will be entitled "The Mission of Old Maryland."

An article which will be timely and instructive will be "The Myth about Henry VIII" and will be by Hilaire Belloc in his usual clear and vigorous style.

"Should writers go to jail?" is the question asked and answered by Peggy Burke in "Behind Prison Bars."